



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



HEARINGS

BEFORE

SUBCOMMITTEE

OF

U.S. Congress.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,

CONSISTING OF

MESSRS. FORNEY, DOCKERY, HOLMAN, HENDERSON
OF IOWA, AND DINGLEY,

IN CHARGE OF

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL
APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1894.

WASHINGTON:
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.
1893.



NO
17
46

HJ10
B33
1894
copy 2

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1894.

JANUARY 19, 1893.

The subcommittee having under consideration the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill conducted the following hearings, Hon. A. M. Dockery in the chair.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE A. BARTLETT, DISBURSING CLERK, TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

The CHAIRMAN. I notice an estimate for two disbursing clerks in the Treasury Department. Will you please explain the necessity for those two officers?

Mr. BARTLETT. The only explanation that I can give is that it is necessary by reason of the voluminous amount of work. There were two disbursing officers there when I entered the service. Mr. Hogg was appointed about eighteen years ago. As to any further reason I am unable to say. The work is supposed to be divided.

The CHAIRMAN. What accounts do you disburse?

Mr. BARTLETT. I have to disburse eighty-odd different appropriations. There were 80 regular ones, and 60 have been added, making 140. I pay all the custodians, janitors, engineers, firemen, charwomen, of all the public buildings by check, and I pay by check all the steamboat inspectors throughout the country, the special agents and inspectors of customs, marine hospitals, salaries of the quarantine service, and the Life-Saving Service and Revenue Marine Service.

The CHAIRMAN. Your time is fully employed?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes, sir: I am behind all the time in my work, and I have two clerks detailed now to assist me.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is the other disbursing clerk?

Mr. BARTLETT. Thomas J. Hogg.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you familiar with the duties of his office?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am not, except that the work is about evenly divided. He has a certain class of work, and I have another certain class of work.

Mr. DINGLEY. You ask for an additional clerk of class 2.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes, sir.

STATEMENT OF T. B. COULTER, SIXTH AUDITOR.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you state in a few words the increases you ask?

Mr. COULTER. I ask for 10 clerks at \$1,000; 20 female laborers at \$600; probably 10 male laborers. I asked for the same last year, in view of the condition of the money-order business. We had about 11,000 different money-order offices in operation, and I could not do the work as it should have been done. The Postmaster-General has now created 9,000 additional money-order offices, which is nearly double what it was. We had some legislation respecting the time in which the postmasters should make returns. That helped us a great deal. If it had not been for that we would have been compelled to have 75 clerks to do that work.

The CHAIRMAN. How far are you behind with the money-order business?

Mr. COULTER. We are right up, so far as the statements of accounts are concerned; but in assorting and checking we are always a year behind. For in-

stance, when we get a statement from the postmaster at Portland, Oregon, that he has issued a money order of a certain amount, we charge that to his account, and his account can not be settled until the order comes in, even though it may be ten or twelve months afterwards. Unless we have a force that will enable us to keep up with the postmaster there is great danger of defalcation.

The CHAIRMAN. How far are you in arrears in that work?

Mr. COULTER. So far as assorting and checking is concerned, probably fifteen or sixteen months behind on the average; some are ten months behind and some as long as eighteen months.

The CHAIRMAN. How far were you behind twelve months ago in that respect?

Mr. COULTER. We are dropping behind every day. There is no provision for this accumulation of work.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the increase in the offices to which you have referred made by reason of legislation or departmental regulation?

Mr. COULTER. It was not legislation, but it was made in the discretion of the Postmaster-General in establishing a number of new money-order offices.

The CHAIRMAN. On what basis?

Mr. COULTER. I do not know on what basis. He went to work and established them by the thousands.

The CHAIRMAN. Were there not rules by which he was guided? I think that heretofore the regulations have required that in order to establish a new money-order office the receipts should amount to \$250 a year.

Mr. COULTER. That is the basis on which the fourth-class offices are raised to Presidential offices.

The CHAIRMAN. At this time how many orders are not assorted?

Mr. COULTER. I suppose that it would foot up 28,000,000. We get 18,000,000, or about one and a half millions a month. It amounts to about 6 tons of matter a month.

Mr. DINGLEY. If there should be no increase in your force, what would the probable condition of the business be at the end of the fiscal year 1894?

Mr. COULTER. It would be absolutely impossible to make settlements with retiring postmasters; we could not do it at all. For instance, we could do business much better with a postmaster who stays than with one who goes out. We send his accounts every quarter; but the moment he goes out of office he must arrange for a settlement, and we can not settle with him until all the orders which his office has issued have been received.

Mr. DINGLEY. What use do you propose to make of these male and female laborers?

Mr. COULTER. The reason I ask for them in that way is on account of the compensation which they are to be paid. While it is to some extent against the operations of the civil-service law to employ these people at that kind of work, I confess that I do it.

The CHAIRMAN. Are these people outside of the civil service?

Mr. COULTER. All those I am asking for are, except the ten clerks. The civil service takes in clerks at \$720 and under. Any person who has good eyes and nimble fingers can assort these money orders just as well as a graduate of Yale.

Mr. DINGLEY. For that reason, you think women would be better for that particular work?

Mr. COULTER. My observation is that two women are worth three men in that work. It is a good clerk that will handle three thousand a day.

The CHAIRMAN. What increase of force did we give you last year?

Mr. COULTER. None. You had it in the bill, but it was cut out for some reason.

The CHAIRMAN. On a review of this estimate could you not reduce it somewhat without detriment to the public service?

Mr. COULTER. If I were going to make any exception at all (I do not believe I should make any), I would say that there ought to be 60 additional people in there for a year in order to do full justice to my successor.

Mr. HOLMAN. There has always been, on the part of a number of persons familiar with your office, complaints that there are a great many inefficient persons employed there. I do not know upon what ground the complaints have been made.

Mr. COULTER. I will tell you how I account for that. For years, as I understand it, the Sixth Auditor's office was designated as the Botany Bay of the Treasury Department. When a man got unruly, the mode of punishment in-

flicted was to send him to the Sixth Auditor's office. There were a great many inefficient people crowded into that office in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. You estimated last year that 33 per cent of your force was inefficient.

Mr. COULTER. I said 33 per cent would not be employed in commercial business outside of the Government. I say that yet. I know clerks getting \$1,000 who could not go outside and get \$300 to save their lives. My office is a little peculiar, from the fact that we have a quarterly system of accountability. Unless we had a sufficient force to audit the accounts of postmasters for the quarter ending December 31, I think that it is likely that out of the 67,000 postmasters there would be greater danger to the Government of defalcations. The closer we keep up with the accounts of the postmasters the better it is. There is no loss now on that account, as we are right at their heels. The postmasters know within fifteen days how their accounts stand.

Mr. HOLMAN. One of your predecessors, I think a gentleman from New Hampshire, formerly a member of the House, told me at one time that there was a great deal of duplication of work in your office that ought to be dispensed with. He pointed to me, as I went through the office, a number of instances where work was being performed, perhaps required by law, which was not essential. Has anything of that kind occurred to you?

Mr. COULTER. So far as I have had any ability to do so, I have rectified all that. I have saved the work of about sixty clerks.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is there any legislation that will help that?

Mr. COULTER. Here is the trouble: Our office is a peculiar office. It is under the Treasury Department, but it is doing work for the Post-Office Department. I tried last winter to remedy the matter and framed an amendment myself which I think ought to become a law. There is work done in the Post-Office Department that ought not to be done there. There are clerks employed in the Post-Office Department who if they were excused every morning when they present themselves at the Department would save money to the Government.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is it because they are inefficient?

Mr. COULTER. No, sir; it is because they are doing work that is practically nonsensical.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is it required by law?

Mr. COULTER. No, sir. It is doing work just as it was done forty years ago, and the need of which has been wiped out by legislation. When a postmaster makes a deposit of, say, \$25, the present arrangement is to send him back two receipts. He keeps a duplicate and sends the original to the Third Assistant Postmaster-General, but for what purpose I claim I can not see. Up at that office they have big books, and they enter that as being received on a certain day. They get 255,000 of such letters a year. In itself it is of no earthly benefit. What I sought to have done was to have the deposits sent originally to the Auditor's office.

Mr. DINGLEY. You say that that provision was left out of the bill?

Mr. COULTER. Yes, sir; it was left out on a letter of the Postmaster-General.

Mr. HOLMAN (to Mr. Courts). Have you the terms of that?

Mr. COURTS. It was not presented to this committee: it was on the post-office bill.

Mr. HOLMAN (to Mr. Coulter). Can you repeat the terms of that provision?

Mr. COULTER. It designated that the depositor or assistant who receives the money should send duplicate receipts of the amount deposited, and that afterward the Auditor should place it in the postmaster's account.

Mr. HOLMAN. How many clerks would that dispense with?

Mr. COULTER. Seven or eight people. It would enable our office to do business with 100 intelligent men, as against 67,000 men who are not generally intelligent. A great many postmasters do not know what to do with that after they get it. It brings the Department into this condition. We write, for instance, to a postmaster and tell him that his account shows a balance of \$17.40, for which he may take credit in next account. The clerks in the Post-Office Department look at this and see that he has not a corresponding deposit. They send him a circular to that effect, and he writes me that he does not see why we make so many mistakes, stating that he has a circular from the Department blowing him up for not making his deposit.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that you have prepared a communication to cover that point?

Mr. COULTER. That was before the Committee on Post-Office and Post-Roads. That matter was referred to the Bureau officers, and they recommended to the

Postmaster-General that that should not be changed, as they had been doing it that way for forty years, and must continue to do it that way.

Mr. DINGLEY. The Postmaster-General's conduct is guided by their answer?

Mr. COULTER. Yes, sir: that is the fact.

STATEMENT OF J. N. PATTERSON, SECOND AUDITOR OF THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. HOLMAN. There was an amendment placed on the legislative bill at the last session making an appropriation in regard to the report of the Second Comptroller of all decisions made, whether for or against the claimant. Did that provision render it practicable to reduce the force of your office to any extent?

Mr. PATTERSON. No, sir; it makes really more work for our office. We have to do just the same work and even to revise our own work under this section on page 40. It saves the work for the Comptroller, for instead of sending the disallowed cases we make settlements and inform the claimant or attorney. We make settlements more carefully, because we do not want to go back on our own reports.

Mr. HOLMAN. Does not it save something in the amount of work that is to be done in the Treasury in a great mass of this matter?

Mr. PATTERSON. Very little. We settle these claims, and instead of sending them to the Comptroller we send them to another building, giving the men the same answers that they would get from the Comptroller. I think it makes a little more work for us, because we are more careful.

Mr. HOLMAN. About what proportion is disallowed?

Mr. PATTERSON. At least 60 per cent of pay and bounty claims.

Mr. HOLMAN. Is it increasing or diminishing?

Mr. PATTERSON. It varies. There have been a few more disallowances. The way it has run for several years, there may be one case where there is an allowance, and ten cases where there are disallowances. It is difficult to tell just how that will work. I know the number of allowances were very small or in hand because gradually the amount found is less than the amount found a year ago; but they would average about the same, \$1,100,000.

Mr. HOLMAN. I believe there are no limitations whatever on those claims?

Mr. PATTERSON. I believe not.

Mr. HOLMAN. I think there ought to be a limitation.

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, sir; I think there should be something. For instance, here is a claim that comes in from a man in the service who had a son or daughter and who died. The claim agents will go to the heir and say there is something due, and puts in a claim. That causes us work. We can generally tell whether a man is entitled to anything or not under the law. Still, they keep pressing them in.

Mr. HOLMAN. What limit do you think ought to be imposed?

Mr. PATTERSON. That is a subject which I have not considered enough.

Mr. HOLMAN. Do you think that five years would be enough?

Mr. PATTERSON. Some of these claims run back as many as thirty years. I think they ought to be all in in five years, and yet some injustice might be done by fixing that date as a limit. In some cases a man never looks into the matter until his attention is called to it: his neighbor has received something and he says: "I will put mine in."

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Ferris, I believe, some years ago prepared a provision limiting the time to five or six years?

Mr. PATTERSON. In my report I call attention to that.

Mr. HOLMAN. The subject was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PATTERSON. Here are some remuster cases. There is a bill in the Senate to continue it, and one is always passed to extend the time.

Mr. HOLMAN. The remuster has expired.

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, sir, it has expired. We do not settle anything subsequent to June.

Mr. HOLMAN. It seems to me that so long after the war some general limit ought to be imposed. Mr. Ferris, a very excellent man, and an ex-member of the House, a good many years ago had a talk with me about the matter, and he insisted that no injustice would be done by that limit.

Mr. PATTERSON. His limit was six years. I am in favor of his recommendation.

Mr. HOLMAN. How does that law affect the business in respect to the Second Comptroller?

Mr. PATTERSON. We do not send him the disallowances, except in cases where we are in doubt. I think we have sent him 4 or 5 cases, and we have disallowed 30 or 40 under this. I think out of the last 100 certificates that I signed 8 or 10 went to the Comptroller and the balance came under this law.

Mr. HOLMAN. Have you any idea how much that would reduce the work in the Second Comptroller's Office?

Mr. PATTERSON. The only way I know about that is that at one time we were about five months ahead of him, and I think on pay and bounty he is down to about two months behind. I think under the operation of this law in the course of a year that in pay and bounty claims it would run about equal. He might be behind on Indian accounts somewhat.

Mr. DINGLEY. You spoke about wanting some change in the number of your clerks.

Mr. PATTERSON. We have 49 clerks of class 1. I recommended to the Secretary a year ago that he give us four clerks at \$900. We have no clerks of that class in our office, and it is inconvenient to jump a man from \$840 to \$1,000 or \$1,200. We have people in some other bureaus. Under the arrangement I suggest we would get one more clerk for the same amount of money.

Mr. HOLMAN. Don't you think there can be some reduction made in your force?

Mr. PATTERSON. There could not be any reduction made, except you should conclude to say that I must do the work with a less number of clerks. We have a busy office and we are two years behind on the work of pay and bounty, about 45,000 claims.

Mr. HOLMAN. How many inefficient clerks have you?

Mr. PATTERSON. I think in my report of last year I said about 5 per cent were inefficient. I have clerks getting about \$1,200 who could be put down to \$500.

Mr. HOLMAN. Have you any idea how large a number of clerks are necessarily employed in the Second Comptroller's Office in examining and acting upon the reports of disallowed claims?

Mr. PATTERSON. I have not. I think there are about two; but I do not know. The Second Comptroller has used those clerks for some other purpose. He has been rather weak in his force.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you some \$1,200 clerks who ought not to receive more than \$900?

Mr. PATTERSON. I have not many. Those would be the ones that I would reduce, if I got this change made.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that matter under your control?

Mr. PATTERSON. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Who controls it?

Mr. PATTERSON. The Secretary of the Treasury. These people have friends who use their influence upon the Secretary of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. I am asking your opinion with reference to the public service wholly disregarding the question of politics. Can not you reduce your force of clerks of class 1, and increase the force at \$900, without any injury to the public service? In other words, have you not a lot of people drawing \$1,200 who ought not to be drawing more than \$900?

Mr. PATTERSON. Very few.

The CHAIRMAN. How many?

Mr. PATTERSON. I should think about four or five, but I could not tell without looking at the list.

Mr. HOLMAN. Are they mostly women or men?

Mr. PATTERSON. Both; there are four or five. For instance, I have one \$1,200 clerk who has been away six weeks and has had a substitute. It is to our advantage for him to have a substitute, because the substitute is worth more than the principal.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose we make it 41 clerks of class 1 and 9 at \$900, including your first recommendation?

Mr. PATTERSON. Then I would be losing.

The CHAIRMAN. No; you are simply changing nine from \$1,200 to \$900. You are not gaining anything.

Mr. PATTERSON. On my scheme I was going to get more force for the same money. According to my recommendation I would get one more clerk with the same appropriation, and I would not like to go down quite so low as you suggest.

Mr. DINGLEY. Suppose we make it forty and ten, which will give you an increase of one in your force.

Mr. PATTERSON. I do not think that our \$1,200 list is any too large.

Mr. DINGLEY. Did you not say that you had four or five \$1,200 clerks who would be only fairly entitled to \$900; and did you not instance the case of one \$1,200 clerk who has not been with you for twelve months?

Mr. PATTERSON. The result would be that those clerks would probably remain four or five years longer, and some good clerk would have to go.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a matter of defect in administration for which this committee can not be responsible. That presumes that the Secretary of the Treasury will retain the inefficient clerk (or one who is unable to do anything) at \$1,200, and put in a clerk and give him only \$900. Can not you reduce this number to forty clerks of class 1 and put in nine or ten at \$900 without injury to the public service?

Mr. PATTERSON. Very likely that could be done.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you recommend that that be done?

Mr. PATTERSON. I hardly like to recommend down quite so low as that.

The CHAIRMAN. The \$900 class is under the civil service.

Mr. PATTERSON. They are all under the civil service down to \$720.

Mr. HOLMAN. How much does the substitute receive?

Mr. PATTERSON. The substitute of the \$1,200 clerks get \$700, and the principal gets \$500; and the substitute of the \$1,400 clerks would get \$600, and the principal would get \$800.

Mr. HOLMAN. Are the substitutes as competent as the others?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, sir; they are quite as competent; that is, those we get from the civil service.

Mr. HOLMAN. Does the law authorize that in terms?

Mr. PATTERSON. The substitutes are all called through the civil service, and they are on the list of eligibles.

Mr. HOLMAN. Do you think the law ought to authorize that?

Mr. PATTERSON. I could do more work with these substitutes, and three of those are as good clerks as I have had. I have probably had twenty through the civil service. Every one of the substitutes were people that I have wanted to keep.

Mr. HOLMAN. And they take these positions at low rates?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, sir; sometimes they will work up to \$1,200. I had one case of that kind the other day.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand you to object to reducing this force of class 1 to 40, and increasing the force of clerks of \$900 to 9 in number?

Mr. PATTERSON. I will reduce the number from 49 to 44, and that will be giving me 5 \$900 people and will be a little saving for you.

STATEMENT OF MR. E. O. LEECH, DIRECTOR OF THE MINT.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you coining any silver dollars at this time?

Mr. LEECH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. At what mint?

Mr. LEECH. We are coining a few at all of the mints, but mostly at Carson; some at Philadelphia. We are not coining many at San Francisco.

The CHAIRMAN. Of the mints estimated for here what would be the probable income on account of the profit on the silver?

Mr. LEECH. That would depend on how much the new Secretary of the Treasury would decide to coin. It would be impossible to tell how much that would be. The profit is 35 or 40 per cent. I judge there will not be much coined, but of course I can not say.

The CHAIRMAN. I notice that you estimate for wages of workmen and adjusters at the Carson mint for the ensuing fiscal year the sum of \$60,000.

Mr. LEECH. That is the same estimate that we have made every year. You are perfectly familiar with the fact that I pay for this out of the appropriation for standard silver dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. What would be your income at that mint?

Mr. LEECH. If the new Secretary of the Treasury will allow the coinage of silver dollars to the number of \$150,000 a month, the profit would be about \$50,000.

The CHAIRMAN. This is for wages of adjusters, and also for contingent and incidental expenses.

Mr. LEECH. Certainly. It is only for the wages of workmen. I make them get along on what you give me.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you have any fund of that kind at Denver?

Mr. LEECH. We can not use the profits for any purpose. The profits must be

covered into the Treasury. There is an indefinite appropriation for carrying the law into effect, and that indefinite appropriation is what we use, and not the seniorage. If silver was \$1.33 we could not use anything except that appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. You estimate \$60,000 for wages of workmen and adjusters at Carson for the ensuing fiscal year. Now, if your profit on the seniorage was \$60,000, you could employ that if we did not make a dollar of an appropriation?

Mr. LEECH. Not at all. We cannot use the profits on the coinage of silver for any purpose, except distributing silver dollars. There is an indefinite appropriation in the act of 1890 which authorized the purchase and coinage of silver, and we will use that. We draw that out of the Treasury, and we coin the silver dollars. Whether we get any profit or not has nothing to do with it.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose that we did not appropriate a dollar for the wages of workmen and adjusters, what would you do?

Mr. LEECH. I would shut up.

The CHAIRMAN. And if you coined \$150,000, would you use anything out of this seniorage?

Mr. LEECH. I would use the indefinite appropriation of about \$1,500 a month, or shut up the mint if you did not appropriate anything. As long as you appropriate partially I could get enough to make that up, as I was authorized to do so by resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. How many mints have you coining silver?

Mr. LEECH. We coin some at each mint. I do not think I shall coin any more at Carson. We can pay for gold in silver dollars, and it is some advantage to the Government to do that. At Philadelphia all the silver dollars we have are in a large vault under seal. I am letting them coin some silver dollars there for our current shipments. At New Orleans and San Francisco I do not intend to coin any more.

Mr. DINGLEY. How many silver dollars are being coined at Carson?

Mr. LEECH. \$150,000 a month.

Mr. DINGLEY. And how much at Philadelphia?

Mr. LEECH. The last month we coined \$200,000 at Philadelphia.

Mr. DINGLEY. Are you coining elsewhere?

Mr. LEECH. I have been, but I am not going to continue after this month. We coined \$200,000 last month at New Orleans and \$100,000 at San Francisco.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you coin anything at Carson except silver?

Mr. LEECH. Yes, sir; gold.

The CHAIRMAN. About how much a month?

Mr. LEECH. At Carson we coined \$2,177,000 in gold.

Mr. DINGLEY. Will you probably coin as much during the current year; that is, during the present year will you continue to coin about the same number of dollars?

Mr. LEECH. I shall, unless I am ordered to do otherwise.

Mr. DINGLEY. For the next fiscal year there will be no coinage of standard silver dollars, unless we appropriate, as you would have no fund with which to do it?

Mr. LEECH. Certainly not.

Mr. DINGLEY. That would stop the coinage of silver?

Mr. LEECH. I do not think we could run the mint at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose we made no appropriation for the coinage of silver at Carson, would that interfere with the coinage of gold?

Mr. LEECH. I do not think we could run the mint on that appropriation. It would not employ enough people to attend to the mechanical processes. If I coin any silver dollars at all I can get along, because it helps to keep enough people to do both kinds of coinage.

Mr. DINGLEY. You would take it out of the indefinite appropriation of the Sherman act?

Mr. LEECH. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLMAN. What is the extent of the work done at the assay office at Charlotte, N. C.?

Mr. LEECH. The deposits of the Apalachian range and all of the Southern States from Virginia west go to that office. It almost pays expenses, and it is one of the most inexpensive in the service.

Mr. HOLMAN. Its earnings are about \$2,000, and its expenses are about \$5,000, are they not?

Mr. LEECH (referring to a paper). The earnings are \$1,700, and the expenses \$5,000. It would be a great inconvenience to all the smaller producers in that sec-

en doing it

answer?

OF THE

re bill at the
econd Comp-
id that pro-
tent?

We have
ction on
the dis-
y. We
our own.

is to be

ending
en the
akes a

wances.

is an
tell
ll or
id a

4?

ice,
gh-
ne-
ell
ep

ter
he

bought, plants have been erected and conducted, vessels bought and managed, and the quarantine work has very materially increased.

Mr. DINGLEY. Are the expenses paid from the tonnage duties of vessels in the foreign trade?

Dr. WYMAN. Yes, sir: so that it does not increase the amount of our appropriation. I am simply asking to be allowed to utilize a little more of the funds which we have already at our disposal.

Mr. DINGLEY. What was the amount received last year from tonnage duties?

Dr. WYMAN (to Mr. Moore). How much was it?

Mr. MOORE. It was \$530,000.

Mr. DINGLEY. What were the expenses?

Mr. MOORE. \$580,000.

Dr. WYMAN. We have made a surplus this year.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is there a surplus every year?

Dr. WYMAN. Not every year: some years we have, and some we have not. The last two years there has been a surplus.

Mr. DINGLEY. You say the quarantine service has increased and rendered a larger official force necessary?

Dr. WYMAN. Yes, sir: very much.

Mr. HOLMAN. How do you account for the increased number of patients in your hospital?

Dr. WYMAN. The number of cases where relief is furnished has increased.

Mr. HOLMAN. Do you think there is any more reason for hospitals under your system on the Ohio and Mississippi rivers than there is for hospitals on the railroads in the West?

Dr. WYMAN. I can only refer you to the act of Congress of 1798, that established marine hospitals for the purpose of aiding marines who were remote from their homes, and to relieve sailors and steamboatmen when they are taken sick at points remote, as the local hospitals and charities in a great many places demand certificate of residence of applicants.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you behind with the work in your office?

Dr. WYMAN. No, sir. We are always up with the current work, but it has entailed a great amount of extra labor, not only upon the part of myself and the officers, but upon the part of certain clerks. Last month one man worked eight days out of office hours.

The CHAIRMAN. What are your office hours?

Dr. WYMAN. From 9 to 4. I have kept them busy sometimes Sundays and holidays.

The CHAIRMAN. You only work about six hours and a half, and even if a clerk works overtime he will not put in over eight hours. Why do you wish to put these new clerks in this high class?

Dr. WYMAN. Because we need clerks of high grade.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose?

Dr. WYMAN. I want these clerks in the quarantine division, which includes not only the business of auditing the accounts of the quarantine hospitals, but issuing contracts both in regard to subsistence and supplies as well as the construction of quarantine plants that are going on. It also includes the auditing of a weekly abstract of sanitary reports. We also have a bacteriological library in that division, and we have no clerk for it. The necessity for this increase has been felt for a long while. I do not believe that any bureau in the Government has clerks which are worked as hard as ours.

Mr. HOLMAN. I notice that in your estimate you ask at most of the stations for the erection of crematories. Do you propose establishing them at all of the stations?

Dr. WYMAN. No, sir. We propose to establish them at the quarantine stations. I think that has been settled by another subcommittee.

Mr. HOLMAN. What will be the cost of those, as a general rule?

Dr. WYMAN. In the neighborhood of \$3,000.

Mr. HOLMAN. Do you regard those as indispensable?

Dr. WYMAN. I do.

Mr. HOLMAN. That money would be spent only in the event of contagion?

Dr. WYMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. You propose to increase the compensation of the messenger which you now have, and to add a new messenger?

Dr. WYMAN. Yes, sir: we have only one messenger, who gets a salary of an assistant messenger, \$600. We have three laborers, two at \$40 a month, and one at \$30 a month, which is not living wages. It is a source of great annoyance to

us, as a man who takes such a place only uses it as a stepping-stone to something better. A man can not live upon \$30 a month.

Mr. DINGLEY. You ask for authority to detail an additional medical officer. How about that?

Dr. WYMAN. That officer we need in the quarantine division to take special charge of the collection of statistics and data on sanitary information, and to superintend the auditing of this abstract, which is distributed to all health authorities.

The CHAIRMAN. How are you going to use these eighteen-hundred-dollar clerks?

Dr. WYMAN. They must be high-grade clerks, and one of them must be a stenographer. I would like to explain fully their labors. They should be men of exceptional intelligence, because we have two laboratories which are in constant use in the purveying division. We send medicines to all of the hospitals. These men will be occupied constantly in packing and shipping drugs. We have our bureau in a five-story building. In the basement is the laboratory of the purveying division, where we compound extracts and tinctures. This increase in the lower grade is absolutely necessary for the proper performance of the labor and the care of the building.

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEORGE B. DAVIS, IN CHARGE OF THE PUBLICATION OFFICE, RECORDS OF THE REBELLION.

Mr. DINGLEY. You ask for an increase of one messenger and two laborers?

Maj. DAVIS. I withdraw it, because it is a clerical error. When this was made up we copied the old law, and that mistake was made.

Mr. DINGLEY. You suggest a change of language: instead of one agent you want one collector of Confederate records?

Maj. DAVIS. Yes, sir. When this matter comes up before you each year there is some little question or criticism about titles, and if there is any change desired it is generally made. I have no suggestion to make in reference to that.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is not done because the Comptroller desires it?

Maj. DAVIS. No, sir. These suggestions generally come from the committee. It was made last year by Gen. Forney, and Governor Sayers made a suggestion this year. I am always willing to make those changes.

The CHAIRMAN. Have not the duties heretofore been performed by that agent been practically completed?

Maj. DAVIS. No, sir. The whole thing will be finished in a year or two; but within the last year or so there has been an organization of Confederate Veterans which has spread in several of the Southern States, and in many of the Northern ones. The chief duty of these agents is to collect data and information in regard to the operations of the Confederate armies, and he is continually going about getting Confederate documents.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, that agent is essential to the prosecution of the work?

Maj. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. There has been no such diminution of the work as would warrant us in striking that from the bill?

Maj. DAVIS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you reduce your force in any way?

Maj. DAVIS. I have intended to do it this year. I intended to suggest a reduction in the sundry civil bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think you can reduce this force now?

Maj. DAVIS. No, sir. This is the old force, and these people have always been connected with the work.

The CHAIRMAN. So you need that force?

Maj. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

STATEMENT OF COL. F. C. AINSWORTH.

The CHAIRMAN. I notice that you estimate \$1,009,390 for the clerical force of your office for 1894, and in that connection I desire to call attention to your testimony given before this committee at the last session of Congress. I will read it:

"Mr. DOCKERY. Do you think it is real economy to maintain the present force?"

"Maj. AINSWORTH. I know it is. It is policy to do it until the records are safe. They were made on very poor paper, and have been handled constantly for years on examinations made necessary by calls from the Pension Office and the Auditors and Comptrollers, and for other purposes, and they are in as many fragments as there are folds.

"The CHAIRMAN. The record you are now making is of a permanent character?"

"Mr. AINSWORTH. Yes, sir. As soon as the records of the States are complete one man can do the work that twenty men could not possibly do under the old system.

"Mr. DOCKERY. Do you think you can reduce as many as 500 or 600 next year?"

"Maj. AINSWORTH. I think so. I do not want to make a guess about that, because it would be only a guess; but the reduction will be a very large one, and it will involve the saving of many hundreds of thousands of dollars in salaries alone.

"Mr. DOCKERY. What saving do you estimate?"

"Maj. AINSWORTH. It is an entire guess.

"Mr. DOCKERY. What do you 'guess'? Your guesses are generally pretty good.

"Maj. AINSWORTH. I think not less than \$800,000 annually."

Col. AINSWORTH. Yes, sir; that is right, and I will do it, too. I can not do it this year for two reasons: In the work of reproducing the records of the war of 1861 '65, the work of transcribing is not completed. In addition to this the act of Congress approved July 27, 1892, directs that the records of the war of the Revolution and the war of 1812 should be transferred to my office, to be indexed in the same way. I can give you something more than a guess this time. My report contains that matter, and I will read the language of it.

The report was read, as follows:

"To the reproduction of the records not yet carded is also to be added that of the military records of the wars of the Revolution and 1812, now filed in the Treasury and Interior Departments, none of them having been in the possession of the War Department. In order that these scattered records might be more readily accessible for reference it was provided during the first session of the present Congress, by an enactment approved July 27, 1892, that the military records of the American Revolution and of the war of 1812, now preserved in the Treasury and Interior Departments, be transferred to the War Department to be preserved in the Record and Pension Division [Office] of that department, and that they shall be properly indexed and arranged for use."

"It should be observed in this connection that the plan of reproducing the records of volunteers, which was at first intended to apply only to those of the late war, has been very much enlarged and has been made to embrace all the previous wars, including the Mexican and various Indian wars, of which there are any records in this office; so that there is a complete card index on file for each of the States that have been carded, showing the service, so far as recorded in this Department, of all the volunteers of that State that have been mustered into the service of the United States since the war of 1812."

It has been necessary to include in the records to be reproduced all the records of those Indian wars, and that has been specially necessary in view of the remoteness of the time and the short duration of periods of these wars. The survivors are able to furnish but little information concerning such service. Under the old system it would be difficult, if not impossible, to furnish any evidence of the service from the original records. It is possible now to furnish the records of service in any case without difficulty. The records of the war of the rebellion have been all completed, except the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, the Veteran Reserve Corps, as well as other United States volunteers, post detachments, and miscellaneous records.

The CHAIRMAN. With your present force how long will it require to complete the work?

Col. AINSWORTH. I estimate the records of the State of Ohio, which was the third largest State in point of number of troops furnished, will be reproduced on the 17th of April, 1893; the records of Indiana, which was the fifth largest State in point of number of troops furnished, will be completed on June 30, 1893; that the records of Illinois, which was the fourth largest State in point of number of troops furnished, will be completed October 15, 1893; and that the records of the

Veteran Reserve Corps and United States Volunteers and the post detachments and miscellaneous records will be completed March 8, 1894.

Of course this is at best but an estimate, but I am satisfied from previous experience that it is very nearly correct.

Mr. DINGLEY. In the mean time will you be at work on the Indian wars and the Revolutionary war?

Col. AINSWORTH. I am carrying on that at the same time.

Mr. DINGLEY. When will it be completed?

Col. AINSWORTH. Included in the above estimate are the records of the Mexican war and all the Indian wars. I card with each State all its records. The records of the war of the Revolution I can not estimate definitely, because they have not all been transferred. There were about 250,000 enlistments in the war of the Revolution. In the war of 1812 there were about 471,000 enlistments.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you entered upon that work?

Col. AINSWORTH. No.

Mr. DINGLEY. How many enlistments were there in the Mexican war?

Col. AINSWORTH. I have not that in my mind. In the war of the rebellion there were 2,770,000.

The CHAIRMAN. This act does not require the indexing of the records of the war with Mexico?

Col. AINSWORTH. No, sir; and neither does any act require the indexing of the war of the rebellion; but I carry the Mexican war right along with the others, and since the passage of the Mexican war pension bill it has become necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you can give no estimate as to when the work of indexing the records of the war of the Revolution will be completed?

Col. AINSWORTH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And no estimate as to the time when the indexing of the military records of the war of 1812 will be completed?

Col. AINSWORTH. No, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. But you regard it as wise to do it?

Col. AINSWORTH. Yes, sir: as we save an immense amount of labor, probably the labor of twenty men, in the future.

Mr. DINGLEY. You think you will complete the whole work in 1894?

Col. AINSWORTH. No, sir: because the records of the war of the rebellion, which must be preserved before anything else can be done, will not be completed before the 8th of March, 1894; but the records of the other wars will go on rapidly, and I think, if Congress would see fit to do so, that in the next appropriation bill some reduction can be made, because I will not require the whole force for the following year to complete the records of the war of 1812.

The CHAIRMAN. With a view of endeavoring to ascertain the probable time that will be required to complete that work alone, will you give us the number of enlistments of the war of the rebellion and an opinion as to the time it will require to do that indexing?

Col. AINSWORTH. There were 2,865,023 enlistments in the war of the rebellion.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been engaged upon that work with your present force?

Col. AINSWORTH. Of course, the whole force that I now have has not been engaged on that work all the time. I had no additional force for this purpose at the beginning, but I commenced the work and the cards began to accumulate and made the current work easier. After awhile I released more men, made more cards, and so on, so that now I have a large and constantly increasing force on those cards, and it makes the work easier.

The CHAIRMAN. Can not you give us an average of the time, so as to be able to say about how many have been employed on the work of card indexing?

Col. AINSWORTH. That would be difficult. I commenced the medical cards in 1884 with only three or four men.

The CHAIRMAN. How long did you continue with that force?

Col. AINSWORTH. In a few days more I put on more men, and as soon as I found I could keep the current work up I put on still more.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think it would be an extravagant estimate (with your present force) to say that they have been employed four years in bringing the work to its present state?

Col. AINSWORTH. I would not like to make that statement. That, however, would not help you, because you can not compare the records of the war of the Revolution and the war of 1812 with the records of the war of the rebellion, be-

cause in the rebellion the men were in service a long time, and the records are correspondingly voluminous, while in the war of 1812 the men served only a very little while, a great many of them serving only a few days. Their enlistments would cover only a very few cards, while in the records of the rebellion enlistments may have forty or fifty cards.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your present force?

Col. AINSWORTH. The total employés are 858 persons, of whom 797 are clerks and 61 are messengers, laborers, and watchman, not in the classified service.

The CHAIRMAN. Not having in contemplation the legislation of the last Congress, which you have cited, you estimated at the last session that you could probably reduce the force from 500 to 600. What have you to say as to that?

Col. AINSWORTH. I estimated that I could do it upon completion of the work of transcribing the records.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you not say that you would do it during the present fiscal year.

Col. AINSWORTH. On the contingency that the records could be completed. I do not think I stated that I could do it during this fiscal year—at least I did not mean to be so understood.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me call your attention to your language. I read from the record:

"The military records, including muster rolls and other important military records of all the States, have been reproduced, except the States of Pennsylvania, Michigan, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois. All the other States are done, and the records are sufficiently up. Pennsylvania was the second State in point of size in the Union in the number of troops furnished: Ohio next, and Indiana and Illinois next in their order. I think, if no reduction of force is made, we will be able to complete the whole of it by the end of this fiscal year. If a reduction of force is made it will delay the work very much longer, and in addition to that the records will go to destruction."

The CHAIRMAN (continuing). If you had estimated a reduction of say 500, not having in contemplation the law of the last session, how would you have employed the remaining force in the office?

Col. AINSWORTH. On the current work of the office. If you should see fit to stop, you can make a reduction at any time; but it would be good policy and businesslike to make the appropriation. I promised that I would do so as soon as it can be done, and the work will be completed as rapidly as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. Did not Secretary Proctor estimate a reduction of 600 people in your office for the coming year, and was not that in accordance with your evidence and confirmatory of it?

Col. AINSWORTH. The Secretary of War made a statement at a time when the work was not sufficiently far advanced to enable any reliable estimate to be made as to the probable time of the completion of the work. I was careful to state to him and was also careful to state to this committee when I was before it at the last session of Congress that any estimate of this kind would be nothing more than a guess, because it was impossible to tell in advance of taking up the records and transcribing them what the condition was and what amount of labor would be involved in their transcription?

The CHAIRMAN. Your "guess," as you put it, was made the April following the report of the Secretary of War, the latter being in December?

Col. AINSWORTH. Yes, sir:

The CHAIRMAN. At that time what work was uncompleted in your office?

Col. AINSWORTH. In April, 1892, the Wisconsin, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, the Veteran Reserve Corps, and other United States volunteers, the post detachment and miscellaneous records were still uncompleted. The State of Pennsylvania alone was not finished until December 2, 1892. This State was the second largest in point of number of troops furnished, and its records were very difficult to transcribe, which considerably delayed the final completion of the work.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I want to call your attention to your testimony given before this committee at the last session—some time during the month of April. I read from the record—

"Mr. DOCKERY. Do you think you can reduce as many as 500 or 600 next year?"

"Maj. AINSWORTH. I think so. I do not want to make a guess about that, because it would be only a guess, but the reduction will be a very large one, and it will involve the saving of many hundreds of thousands of dollars in salaries alone."

Col. AINSWORTH. What was the date of that hearing? Because it is difficult for me to tell from this memorandum the exact state of the work at that time; but if it was in May, Wisconsin was completed, and if not, I am doubtful about it. Certainly Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Indiana were completed.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to put in the record that, by reference to the testimony the exact date of your examination was April 27, 1892. The point I want to emphasize is that you seemed then to be positive in your statement that you would be able to complete the work by the end of the present fiscal year.

Mr. HOLMAN. How many hours daily is your force employed?

Col. AINSWORTH. They work from 9 to 4, with half an hour for lunch. The actual working time is six and a half hours.

Mr. HOLMAN. And the law fixes eight hours?

Col. AINSWORTH. The law fixes not less than seven hours.

Mr. HOLMAN. But as a rule they only work six and one-half hours?

Col. AINSWORTH. Yes, sir; because they are given by the heads of the Departments half an hour at noon.

Mr. HOLMAN. Why is it that the eight-hour rule does not properly apply to the Departments?

Col. AINSWORTH. It ought to be applied to the Departments, and there is no reason why the clerks should not be made to work eight hours a day. I work from twelve to fourteen hours sometimes, and I think the clerks should work eight hours.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of any reason why the clerks in your Bureau should not be required to work eight hours a day?

Col. AINSWORTH. I do not know why the clerks in my Bureau, or the clerks in any other Bureau, for that matter, should not be required to work eight hours a day, and in saying that I include the heads of bureaus as well as the clerks and the messengers.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course the effect of such an order would be to expedite the work in your office?

Col. AINSWORTH. I think it would.

JANUARY 21, 1893.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

STATEMENT OF GEN. CYRUS BUSSEY, AS ISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

The CHAIRMAN. You may state your name and official position?

Gen. BUSSEY. Cyrus Bussey, Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. I notice an estimate on page 105 of the bill before you for nine members of the Board of Pension Appeals; will you kindly state to the committee the condition of the work before that Board?

Gen. BUSSEY. The work of the Board of Pension Appeals has run along for the last three years with very little variation. There is now pending before the Board unadjudicated, or was on the 14th day of the month, 4,678 appeals, 87 fee appeals, and 179 motions for reconsideration.

The CHAIRMAN. How does that state of the work compare with the work one year ago?

Gen. BUSSEY. One year ago there were 5,030 original appeals, 182 motions for reconsideration, and 75 fee appeals pending, so that it appears by this report of January 14th that we have reduced the number three or four hundred during the year. But appeals are coming in. Last week there were 115 original appeals filed, and two motions for reconsideration—

Mr. DINGLEY. Those are appeals from the decisions of the office?

Gen. BUSSEY. From the decision of the Commissioner of Pensions—and 15 fee appeals filed. There are appeals filed nearly as fast as they are adjudicated and I find by the reports of 1890 and 1891 that we had about the same number pending each year.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think it is practical to reduce that force without detriment to the service?

Gen. BUSSEY. I do not think it is this year. I think after one more year the

Board can be reduced without any injury to the service. When we take into consideration the great extent of the work of the Pension Office and the great number of questions that arise there which have to be attended to by the Department in order to have systematic work carried on, the work of the office could not be well handled with less than nine members of the Board of Appeals.

Mr. DINGLEY. How far behind are you in this work?

Gen. BUSSEY. We are nearly a year behind. It would take a year substantially to work up the work that is now before the office, or very nearly. Probably we are eight, nine, or ten months behind.

The CHAIRMAN. I notice also an estimate for two special land inspectors connected with the administration of the public-land service to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and to be subject to his direction. Are you familiar with the duties of these inspectors?

Gen. BUSSEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And the necessity, if any, for their continuance?

Gen. BUSSEY. In my opinion, those officers are necessary to the Secretary. For instance, when any question arises of importance connected with the public lands, such as has arisen in Oklahoma, and which are certain to arise when any new lands are thrown open to settlement, a person on the ground as a representative of the Secretary of the Interior—a man clothed with power—has a great restraint in its way on any bad element that may gather there, and these officers have been used to go from place to place and look after the interests of the Government or any duty the Secretary of the Interior may deem essential, and to investigate any officer who has failed in his duty in any respect.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think it is necessary to continue the two?

Gen. BUSSEY. Yes, sir; I think, in view of the probable opening up of new territory, that those two men should be continued. I think they are of great service to the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. I desire to call your attention to the act of March 3, 1891, which, as I recollect it, confirmed certain contest cases which would operate to diminish the work of the office, and possibly and probably obviate the necessity of continuing these two officers. What, if any effect, has that law had upon the work of the office?

Gen. BUSSEY. I could not answer that question, for the reason the land questions have been disposed of by Judge Chandler, Judge Shields, and the Secretary; that does not come to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Commissioner of the General Land Office would have some information on that point, and he will be here this morning.

Gen. BUSSEY. Yes, sir; I would rather not answer on that point.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I desire to invite your attention to an estimate for the office of the assistant attorney-general, found on page 106 of the bill before you. It calls for \$40,550, which is the appropriation for the current year, and if you notice the note the appropriations made prior to 1892 were very much smaller for this office. Now, then, in view of the legislation with respect to land questions and the diminution of the work (at least what we suppose to be a diminution of the work), could not the force of that office be reduced without any injury whatever to the public service?

Gen. BUSSEY. I would not like, for the same reason, to answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. Who prepared that estimate?

Gen. BUSSEY. That estimate, I presume, was prepared by Judge Shields, the assistant attorney-general.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well; we will call him. Now, then, turn to page 110. You will find there an estimate for the clerical force of the Pension Office. Did you revise or review that estimate?

Gen. BUSSEY. No, I do not think I did; that is the general estimate for the clerical force.

The CHAIRMAN. You had nothing to do with that?

Gen. BUSSEY. No; I had nothing to do with that.

The CHAIRMAN. You did revise or review the estimate of the appropriation for pensions?

Gen. BUSSEY. Yes, sir; I went through that.

The CHAIRMAN. In your judgment, does that estimate provide a sufficient amount for pensions?

Gen. BUSSEY. I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you do not agree with the Commissioner of Pensions in his estimate requiring a larger amount?

Gen. BUSSEY. The estimate the Commissioner made with regard to the deficiency the first time, when he made his estimate of \$10,500,000, that estimate was based upon the work of the first four months of the year, and we calculated that if the Department did as much business the next eight months that \$10,500,000 would be required

to pay the deficiency. Later on he made an estimate based on six months, when it appeared that a larger amount of work had been done in the two months than had been done in the four months, comparatively. The work varies. The estimate upon which the \$13,800,000 was made was based upon the amount of money that was paid out by the pension agents, while the first estimate was made upon the value of the certificates issued in a certain time. It appears the pension agents paid out a little more money, some two or three hundred thousand dollars more than the certificates issued in the same time for the reason they paid some certificates that went over, so that the figures were not exactly the same.

The CHAIRMAN. When you say you base your estimates on the amounts paid out, do you mean the amount of pension checks issued by the pension agents or the amount actually paid by the Treasury?

Gen. BUSSEY. The actual amount paid by the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. And not upon the amount of pension checks actually issued by the pension agencies?

Gen. BUSSEY. Perhaps it was issued upon the amount of pension checks actually issued by the pension agents. I think it was. The pension agents issued a voucher when they received a certificate, and consequently he may have received certificates and persons carried them in their pockets for an indefinite time from the last quarter, for, as you know, a certain number hang over and are not paid; so in a given time a larger number of certificates may come in than were actually issued during that same time, and it happened in this case, and we found that \$200,000 or \$300,000 had been paid by the agents more than had been issued by the Department in the meantime. Then, again, there are interruptions. For instance, yesterday the whole work of the Pension Office ceased. Then, again, when a new administration comes in and there is a new medical referee—all the business of the Pension Office must pass through the medical division, and that is the gauge of the amount of work accomplished. If you have an intelligent medical referee there he will want to know exactly how the business is and will want to be sure it is done properly; and, naturally, for a time he can not work as rapidly, and will not, and can not, do as much work as has been done right along as if there had been no change of administration. Now, to illustrate that, when Mr. Tanner came in, from the 4th of March up to October, when Commissioner Black had issued, I think, about 87,000 pension claims, Commissioner Tanner in the same length of time only issued 70,000, a falling off of about 17,000 claims. So a change of administration necessarily retards the work, and I take it for granted it will do so again.

Mr. DINGLEY. Then, as I understand, the difference in the estimate of the deficiency between you and the Commissioner has arisen—and here is the Commissioner now, so we may verify that—arises from two causes. First, your estimate was based on the work of the first four months of this year and the Commissioner's estimate was based on the work of the first six months, or rather on the work of the two intervening months; that was cause No. 1?

Gen. BUSSEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. Cause No. 2 was, the Commissioner estimated that the business was going along at the same speed under a change of administration and you did not; you estimated, judging from the result when this administration came in, that there would be a falling off on that point?

Gen. BUSSEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. It is on these points entirely that this difference has arisen in the estimates?

Gen. BUSSEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. I notice Commissioner Raum is here. (To Commissioner Raum.) I understand those to be simply the points. The question was with reference to the difference in the estimated deficiency, one of about \$10,000,000 and the other about \$13,500,000, as to what was the cause as to the difference in the estimate, and Secretary Bussey has explained that it arises from those two points I have just suggested.

Commissioner RAUM: Those were substantially the reasons for the difference. There is a slight difference in it, too, that grows out of the fact that when that first estimate was made, in mousing through our statistics I found a more accurate method of determining the number of persons and the value of their pensions that would be dropped from the roll than we had before, and the estimate for the number and value of those who would be dropped from that \$10,000,000 was a little greater, but that would not be very much; but that was one of the causes.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand you now to say you based your estimate upon the amount of the pension checks issued by the pension agents?

Gen. BUSSEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And not upon the amount of pension money paid by the Treasury?

Gen. BUSSEY (to Commissioner Raum). I stated, Mr. Commissioner, that your last estimate—

The CHAIRMAN. Just one word more before we call the Commissioner. Now, then, will you kindly state to the committee the difference between the amount of the pension checks issued by the pension agents prior to the 1st of January and the amount of money actually paid by the Treasury?

Gen. BUSSEY. Well, we have no means of knowing the amount of money paid by the Treasury, for the reason we have to get our information from the agents.

The CHAIRMAN. And you rely upon that?

Gen. BUSSEY. Yes, sir. I was stating, Gen. Raum, that while you had calculated six months' work amounting to so much it appears the pension agents had paid more vouchers than they called for by \$200,000 or \$300,000 in the same time.

Commissioner RAUM. Let me understand that.

Gen. BUSSEY. You telegraphed and got reports from the pension agents of the amount of money they had paid out for the six months from July 1 to January 1, and their reports showed that they had issued vouchers or checks for more money than the six months' work appeared to call for by \$200,000 or \$300,000. It appeared they had paid out so much. The total amount of money paid out for six months, including everything, was \$78,481,649.03, and it appeared that the pension agents, actually issued checks for \$200,000 or \$300,000 more than that amount.

Commissioner RAUM. Well, I can explain that.

Gen. BUSSEY. And that your calculation was based upon the amount paid out by the pension agents, rather than this.

Gen. RAUM. When you come to analyze the business, in my conversation with Gen. Bussey for the purpose of proving to him that this estimate, based upon the cost as shown by the payments made in six months by the pension agents, I went on to show by that calculation the value of the work done in the office as computed in this table; that there was but a slight difference between them, and it was this difference he speaks of; so that the two methods of calculation, the one based upon the actual disbursements and the other based upon the computation of the value of certificates issued from day to day, were nearly the same and that there was no material difference between them.

The CHAIRMAN. That there was no substantial difference? Now, Mr. Secretary, will you kindly state in this connection whether you revised the pension estimate for the ensuing fiscal year?

Gen. BUSSEY. Well, not carefully; I have gone through the figures to some extent.

The CHAIRMAN. In your judgment, is \$165,000,000 an ample amount to appropriate?

Gen. BUSSEY. I think it is.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think the force there provided are capable of performing a sufficient amount of work to warrant a larger expenditure?

Gen. BUSSEY. I do not think it ought to be done. I think there should be a greater scrutiny in the administration of the office and in the allowance of claims than is warranted by an increase of the business. I do not think the work ought to be done any faster than it is being done.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course that question was based on the idea of maintaining the present force and the same vigor of administration during the coming year that has been employed heretofore. You do not mean to intimate that the scrutiny has not been sufficiently rigid heretofore?

Gen. BUSSEY. No; but there are certain causes which enabled the office to do a larger amount of work than in my opinion can be done safely any more rapidly than it can be done now. At the beginning of Commissioner Raum's administration there were virtually a good many completed cases pending under the law where evidence was all filed and everything necessary to the allowance of the claim, and that list is to a great extent worked up.

The CHAIRMAN. When you revised the estimate your judgment was that the force called for was one which involved the expenditure of \$165,000,000?

Gen. BUSSEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And is that your judgment now?

Gen. BUSSEY. That is my judgment now. Well, of course, in a large estimate as that is, between \$165,000,000 and \$172,000,000, that the Commissioner has estimated, there is room for doubt. There are a number of causes that will influence the roll. As I explained to the Commissioner in talking this matter over with him, when you get this roll up to current the less money it will take to pay the first payments. You are aware when the act of June 27 was passed that almost every soldier in the country who believed himself disabled immediately filed a claim for a pension, and that a great number of claims filed in 1890 has been pending before the office and, of course, the tendency has been to increase the value of the first payments, to make it more. Now, as the work progresses and we get nearer to making the work current the first payments will be less, because it will not take so much money to pay, for the reason that the cases will not be pending so long. Another will be the dropping off of the roll of the men who draw the highest rate of pensions, \$72. It was stated by one of the chiefs of division the other day that as many as eighteen

men die who draw \$72 where we put one on the roll, and that will have a tendency to diminish the amount of money required. Again, the cases that have been pending for several years under the old law that carry heavy arrears is very much less than it has been and there are fewer pensions allowed that draw a large amount of money than heretofore, so the tendency will be to lessen the amount of money required for first payments. Now, my impression is, after we have taken from that roll the number of men whose pensions are to be allowed in the next six months and begin on next year's roll, that that will be an important factor, and it will affect the roll \$5,000,000, \$6,000,000, or \$7,000,000; at any rate, the amount of money involved between Commissioner Raum's estimate and the \$165,000,000; and I think that is sufficient for next year.

The CHAIRMAN. I note that the appropriation for the payment of pensions simply including the amount carried in the deficiency bill just reported to the House amounts to \$158,440,000 in round numbers.

Gen. BUSSEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, then, in view of that appropriation for the current fiscal year is it still your judgment that \$165,000,000 will be ample for the ensuing fiscal year?

Gen. BUSSEY. I think it would in view of the fact I expect a falling off of the work from a change of administration and a falling off in the amount of first payments, which I believe will be decidedly felt in the next fiscal year, and I think that \$165,000,000 will be a safe estimate.

The CHAIRMAN. You think, in view of the causes to which you refer, there will be an increase of only \$7,000,000?

Gen. BUSSEY. You have made this calculation and you arrive at the \$158,000,000 after taking \$13,500,000 for a deficiency this year, whereas I base my calculation on \$10,000,500, for I still believe that is all the money that will be spent.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is, the \$165,000,000 will be spent?

Gen. BUSSEY. I believe \$165,000,000 will be sufficient for this Congress to appropriate for next year.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you think the amount of the additional estimate submitted by the Commissioner will not be expended?

Gen. BUSSEY. I do not believe it will be, for reasons which I have stated. The interruption of the inauguration and the loss of a day yesterday and the change of administration will effect the roll to some extent, and as I understand the estimate made is for continuous work right straight along with no interruptions at all, and there will be other interruptions.

PENSION OFFICE.

STATEMENT OF GREEN B. RAUM, COMMISSIONER OF PENSIONS.

The CHAIRMAN. Turn to page 110 of the bill. I notice the estimate for the clerical force of your office for the ensuing fiscal year is the same as the estimate for the current fiscal year?

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Upon a careful review of that estimate do you think it is practicable without detriment to the public service to reduce that force in any way, and if so, where?

Commissioner RAUM. Considering the condition of the work of the office I think it would not be judicious to reduce that force. There is a large amount of business now pending before the office, a very considerable portion of which is ready for action, and the work is being pressed all the while. There is not a spare man or woman there, as I could show if the work of that Bureau is to be conducted with reasonable energy, and I should say that the force should not be reduced at this time. My opinion has been and is that if the work of that Bureau is pushed earnestly for a year or two that the force can then be reduced very properly, and that the pension payments will begin to reduce.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose the present force is continued and the same vigor of administration is maintained under the incoming administration that has obtained under the present administration, what, in your judgment, will be the liability of the Government for the ensuing fiscal year on account of the payment of pensions?

Commissioner RAUM. If the same proportionate amount of work is done next year that has been done during the past six months, say from July 1, 1892, to December 31, 1892, the amount of money required for pensions would be what I estimated the other day—you have that amount—\$172,000,000. That estimate of \$172,000,000 and a fraction was based upon the proposition that the work of the next year would continue at the same gauge and at the same cost as the work during the first six months of this fiscal year.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is, that there would be a proportionate number of allowances?
 Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir; the average cost. That was the plan upon which the calculation was based the other day.

The CHAIRMAN. You estimated when you were before the pension subcommittee that the total liability will be \$178,937,265.35, but in your judgment \$6,000,000 of the amount would be carried into the fiscal year 1895 on unpaid vouchers?

Mr. DINGLEY. And that takes place year after year?

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the unpaid balance carried from the fiscal year 1892 to the current fiscal year?

Commissioner RAUM. Just wait a minute (examining papers); \$2,872,234.76.

The CHAIRMAN. On what do you base your judgment, in view of that unpaid balance, that \$6,000,000 will remain unpaid during the coming fiscal year?

Commissioner RAUM. For the reason the average amount during the last five or six years has been very much greater than this \$2,800,000.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, your judgment is reached by taking the average of unpaid balances of several years?

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir; and, besides, I added this consideration, that there will be more persons on the roll, and of course there would be probably an average of these. Now, I attempted to make these payments as close as possible. I adopted extraordinary measures to make these payments as close as possible.

Mr. DINGLEY. You mean at the beginning of this fiscal year you took extraordinary measures to have as large payments made as possible so as to have the balance going over as small as possible?

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give us the unpaid balance that was carried over from the fiscal year 1891?

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir; \$4,883,224.64.

The CHAIRMAN. Then your estimate of \$6,000,000 that you think will be carried over from the ensuing fiscal year is based on the average of several years?

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You estimate \$5,000,000 will be unpaid this fiscal year which will go into the expenditure of the next fiscal year.

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir; about five million.

The CHAIRMAN. When you were before the committee a few days ago you did not have the exact amount of your original estimate; have you got that estimate now for the ensuing fiscal year?

Commissioner RAUM. I did not bring any papers up here with me, as I did not know exactly what you gentlemen would wish.

The CHAIRMAN. I call your attention to that because you stated in your testimony "there is no privacy violated in stating that when I made this estimate of \$165,000,000 it was somewhat below (I could not give you the exact figures at this moment), it was somewhat below the figures that I had worked out as the amount that probably would be required." You have not that with you?

Commissioner RAUM. I stated there that the estimate finally was based upon the conversation, at which it was thought the amount as stated would be all right.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not recollect about what that estimate was?

Commissioner RAUM. I have not those figures with me.

The CHAIRMAN. On page 112, I notice an estimate of \$215,000 "for per diem when absent from home (and traveling) on duty (outside the District of Columbia) for special examiners or other persons employed in the Bureau of Pensions detailed, etc." What was the expenditure for the fiscal year 1892 on that account?

Commissioner RAUM. \$199,257.21 for 1891. If you would like to have the figures for 1891—

The CHAIRMAN. No; I do not care about the figures.

Commissioner RAUM (continuing). It was very much larger.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, what were the expenditures?

Mr. DINGLEY. I would like to have the figures for 1891 also.

Commissioner RAUM. \$347,599.80.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you had a deficiency, did you not?

Commissioner RAUM. No; we had two appropriations and they were amalgamated in this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the total appropriation for the fiscal year 1891, if you remember?

Commissioner RAUM. It was \$415,000.

The CHAIRMAN. And you expended \$347,599.80. Is that right?

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, can you give me the expenditure up to January 1 on this account?

Commissioner RAUM. Well, I can lay them before you, but I did not bring them

up, as I did not know exactly what you wanted this morning. I have just made an estimate for a deficiency of \$37,000, which I forwarded to the Secretary the other day. I do not know whether that has been sent up here or not.

The CHAIRMAN. Under this head?

Commissioner RAUM. For the present fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. On this account?

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. We have not received that.

Commissioner RAUM (to Mr. Courts). I telegraphed to you.

Mr. COURTS. Yes, sir; but the estimate itself has not come to the House.

Commissioner RAUM. When I communicated the estimate to the Secretary, I then telegraphed to you. You know I stated to the committee that there would be a deficiency and I would make it up, and when I went back I made up the estimate and sent it over to the Secretary and then I telegraphed you. That is \$37,000 and some odd dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, as I understand it, you will expend the entire appropriation and have a deficiency of \$37,000?

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir; for this year.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the occasion of this increased expenditure?

Commissioner RAUM. There has been an increase of work; there have been more cases sent in for adjudication.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it the result of any change of policy?

Commissioner RAUM. Oh, no; not at all. When this new law was passed quite a number of persons who had claims pending under the old law filed claims under the new law, and quite a number of those cases were in the field for examination, and I called those cases all in so that the claim itself, the original claim, would be in the files to be acted upon in connection with the new law, and in that way it partly happened; and then pressing the work pretty earnestly for 1891 the work for 1892 was considerably reduced in amount.

The CHAIRMAN. How many examiners have you in the field now under this appropriation?

Commissioner RAUM. I have 144.

The CHAIRMAN. Under this clause?

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are these clerks detailed from the office?

Commissioner RAUM. Well, there are a few clerks, but most especially examiners.

The CHAIRMAN. What number of the 144 are clerks detailed from the office?

Commissioner RAUM. I really can not give that to you, but I can send it to you if you desire.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not recollect?

Commissioner RAUM. I would not be able to give that, but I can furnish that as soon as I go back to the office. There are probably 30 or 40 clerks.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is the work that has been required of special examiners in the field somewhat behind hand now?

Commissioner RAUM. Well, it has been increased a little for the last six months.

Mr. DINGLEY. Are they behind to a considerable extent in their work?

Commissioner RAUM. Well, there are about 8,000 cases of special examination work.

Mr. DINGLEY. For instance, take my own State; I find cases there about eight months behind.

Commissioner RAUM. I aim not to have them more than six months behind. I issued an order to the effect that no claim should be allowed to get behind six months in the field.

Mr. O'NEIL. But generally speaking, the work is not up?

Commissioner RAUM. Not to what it was two years ago.

Mr. DINGLEY. And that has arisen on account of the withdrawal of cases where a new application has been filed under the new law, which, of course, reduces the number of cases in the field, and since then the return of cases to the field.

Commissioner RAUM. You will understand when that new law was taken up under the regulation of the Department the old law claim and the new law claim was considered together. If the new law claim was completed that was allowed. Now, there are more old law claim cases sent to the field than about a year and a half ago and that is the reason there is an increase. You observe by following these items of expenditure that during the past three and a half years as compared with the same period before we have saved about \$430,000 in that part of the service.

Mr. HOLMAN. On special examiners?

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir. You see here the appropriation and expenditures. You see last year at my own suggestion you reduced that appropriation \$200,000. I recommended that and it was done upon my recommendation.

Mr. HOLMAN. To what extent, if at all, are these special examiners employed under the law of 1890? To what extent do you make special examinations there?

Commissioner RAUM. Not a great many cases under the law of 1890. If a question of fraud is raised or anything of that kind, we send out, but, as a rule, there are not many cases.

Mr. HOLMAN. You have not in your employ now the full number of special examiners, the 150 additional; you have not them all employed now, have you?

Commissioner RAUM. There may be four or five vacancies. We have nine vacancies in all, and there are four or five special-examiner vacancies. We aim to keep 150 employed all the while, and those who are not sent in the field are assigned to duty in the office as clerks.

The CHAIRMAN. I perhaps misunderstood you. I understood you to say, including both of these paragraphs, that you have only 144 examiners in the field.

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir; you understand under the law the Commissioner has the discretion to send either a special examiner or a clerk to the field.

The CHAIRMAN. But you have not the 150 examiners authorized there in the field.

Commissioner RAUM. No, sir; we have not the 150.

Mr. DINGLEY. You have 144?

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. And some of those are clerks, in which case the special examiners are employed in the office?

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And that force is short?

Commissioner RAUM. I think there are five vacancies in the force. You will understand that I have a force of 2,000 people, and that necessarily leaves a vacancy every once in a while by resignations, deaths, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell me why you dropped from your estimate for the ensuing fiscal year this proviso on page 112: "Provided, That five special examiners or clerks detailed and acting as supervising examiners and special examiners or clerks detailed as such, not exceeding three in number, with headquarters in the District of Columbia, may be allowed in addition to their salaries and in lieu of per diem and all expenses for subsistence a sum not exceeding \$900 per annum." Why is that dropped from the estimate?

Commissioner RAUM. I haven't dropped it.

Mr. HOLMAN. Was it the Secretary of the Treasury?

Commissioner RAUM. I do not know. That is in the bill as I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. But you notice all the printed matter included within brackets (according to our way of preparing the bill) is omitted from the estimate.

Mr. DINGLEY. Recommend it to be stricken out.

Mr. HOLMAN. Was it done by the Secretary of the Treasury?

Commissioner RAUM. I did not do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Secretary of the Interior?

Commissioner RAUM. I know nothing about it; I knew nothing of this until now.

The CHAIRMAN (to Gen. Bussey). Do you know why this proviso I have just read was omitted from the estimate?

Commissioner RAUM. I will state for the benefit of the committee—

Secretary BUSSEY. I do not know anything at all about it.

Commissioner RAUM. I would say to the committee this question has been a matter of contest with the Committee on Appropriations for a number of years. Last year, for example, there was an effort to have this stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know any reason why it should be omitted from the estimate?

Mr. HOLMAN. Or any reason why it should be retained?

Commissioner RAUM. Well, I will state to you that if I was running that office beyond this period of time that I would want a change in the organization of the special examiners' division. Under this law, as I found it on the statute books when I went in there, there were five heads, you might say, of the special examination division, and they have their particular districts of country, as ordered by the Commissioner, to supervise. My own judgment is that the true policy of the organization of the special examination division is to have a chief and an assistant chief instead of having five supervising examiners, but I was not disposed to make a recommendation that would interfere with the salaries of a lot of people under this law, and so I let the thing go, although I have frankly stated to the supervising examiners that I thought no division ought to have five chiefs to it. As far as the other branch of it is concerned, that is, legislation of limitation requiring only three persons to be assigned to duty in Washington City, I understand from the traditions of the office that before that was passed a great number of persons were assigned to duty here, and this thing simply limits the number the Commissioner will have authority to assign, and that ought to be kept in.

The CHAIRMAN. Your suggestion, then, would be to provide a chief examiner at a salary of, say, \$2,500?

Commissioner RAUM. Well, I would not enlarge the salary. The five men hold the golden apples of that office.

The CHAIRMAN. Their time is not fully employed?

Commissioner RAUM. Oh, their time is fully employed, but why should a supervising examiner of that office get \$400 more than the chief of the board of review or of the different law divisions?

The CHAIRMAN. The effect of this, then, is to make one chief special examiner and four assistants, and the pay of all exactly the same?

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir; then the Commissioner divides the country into five parts, a certain number of States to one and a certain number of States to the other, and he assigns a special division to each of these five examiners.

The CHAIRMAN. Your suggestion is, that in lieu of this clause we should provide one chief examiner and one assistant, and you think—

Commissioner RAUM. You might say one special examiner, or two. That would do instead of five special examiners. You had better say two special examiners, one as chief of the bureau or division, and the other as assistant.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think the assistant chief ought to receive the same compensation as the chief?

Commissioner RAUM. As I tell you, they get the biggest salaries in the office.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me state the proposition, because I understand Gen. Bussey concurs with you in the recommendation. I want to state it to you again, so as to be sure we understand your recommendation, as we may possibly approve it. I understand that you recommend in lieu of this proviso, providing five special examiners, that there be provided one chief examiner and one assistant examiner, and that your judgment is that the business of the office will be conducted with as much expedition and as great dispatch under that system as under the present?

Commissioner RAUM. I have no doubt of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand you concur in that view (to Gen. Bussey)?

Gen. BUSSEY. Yes, sir; and if I were going to fix it I would provide a chief of that division and an assistant as in any other division.

The CHAIRMAN. What rate of compensation would you suggest?

Gen. BUSSEY. I would give the chief \$2,000, the same as the other chiefs, and I would give the assistant the same salary as the other assistants in other bureaus, which is \$1,800.

Commissioner RAUM. I will state to you that I would have made a recommendation for the reduction of this force but for the impending change in administration, as I did not feel it was quite proper for me to undertake to have some very choice places cut out.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not quite sure that is not a prudent thing to effect and that was the desire of the committee in calling you here, for the purpose of the committee is to give a sufficient force to the administration of the office, but we want to reduce the force wherever it can be done without injury to the public service.

Mr. HOLMAN. The effect of omitting this provision is simply to have a certain number of parties assigned to that duty at salaries of \$1,800; is that the effect of it? If it is omitted the necessary force would be assigned of persons who draw salaries as clerks, I suppose. If that is not the effect of it, what will it be?

Commissioner RAUM. If you omit it? Then you will have to have—it will be necessary to assign a competent man at the head of the division and you would have either to take one of the present heads of a division and put him there or an assistant chief and put him there.

Mr. HOLMAN. A chief of division receives \$2,000?

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLMAN. Well, the estimates of a head of division and an assistant would perhaps be sufficient there?

Commissioner RAUM. I think so, yes, sir. Those five special examiners in the office have for two years understood my views about it but you know it is not very pleasant at any time to cut down a man's salary. They are good men and have done good work, but I do not like that system of organization of having five chiefs at the head of a division at all.

Mr. HOLMAN. You would pay one chief of a division a salary of \$2,000, and one assistant at \$1,800. Do you think that would be sufficient?

Commissioner RAUM. I think so; but I would suggest to you that you gentlemen do not cut out that provision in regard to the three special examiners to the District of Columbia, because I tell you that is a limitation of the law upon the assignments by the Commissioner.

Mr. DINGLEY. That can be transferred below.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand these examiners get \$1,400 salary?

Mr. RAUM. They get \$1,600.

The CHAIRMAN. How is that?

Mr. RAUM. They are \$1,600 clerks assigned to duty there.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the proviso they now get \$900 additional?

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you would not recommend that they be allowed \$900 additional to the \$1,600 for services in the District of Columbia?

Commissioner RAUM. If I was recommending new legislation about it I would say put a chief and an assistant chief at the head of the division.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you refer to the three who have their headquarters in the District of Columbia?

Commissioner RAUM. I do not think I would discriminate against special examiners who were assigned to duty in Washington City. A special examiner here ought to be entitled to the same as all other special examiners who are in the field. They get \$3 a day besides their salary.

The CHAIRMAN. But examiners in the field necessarily incur expenses which would seem to warrant \$900 as additional compensation, but in regard to these folks in this city, do you think they ought to have the \$900 additional?

Commissioner RAUM. I do not think I would like to discriminate against those people.

Mr. DINGLEY. When you send a man away from his home, he is under expenses not only for transportation, but for subsistence?

Commissioner RAUM. The actual working of the thing is, that a man takes his family with him. Say we send them to southern Illinois, where I live. We assign him to some nice town and he goes out there and takes his family, and he puts his children to school and rents a pew in a church, and he is there all fixed.

The CHAIRMAN. But he does not remain in that town in southern Illinois, but he travels all over southern Illinois, whereas the other special examiners not only have their families here, but they also remain here.

Mr. DINGLEY. He has no transportation?

Commissioner RAUM. Transportation is paid extra.

Mr. HOLMAN. How long has that provision been in this bill?

Commissioner RAUM. Well, I can not tell you that.

Mr. HOLMAN. Before your time?

Commissioner RAUM. Long before my time.

Mr. DINGLEY. Are these special examiners appointed under civil-service rules?

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir; those who come in the service now come in under civil-service rules.

Mr. DINGLEY. Are they by law under civil-service examination, or is it simply a regulation of the Pension Office?

Commissioner RAUM. It is by law.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you say to this proviso relating to your clerical force: "Provided, That in order to promote good order, discipline, and efficiency in the Pension Office the Commissioner of Pensions shall be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to discharge from time to time such clerks, messengers, and other persons appointed or employed in the Pension Office as are or shall hereafter become in his judgment unfit, by reason of misconduct or inefficiency, to be retained in the public service. No person so discharged shall be reinstated or reappointed except upon and in accordance with the recommendation of the Commissioner of Pensions?"

Commissioner RAUM. Well, in the first place, I do not think that proviso would stand the test of examination. The Pension Office is a bureau in the Interior Department, and I do not think you can confer upon the Commissioner of Pensions the authority of removal. It may confer upon him the power of recommendation, but I do not think you can confer upon the Commissioner of Pensions the authority to remove people in that office.

Mr. HOLMAN. You could confer that power by law, of course, but it would not seem to be a very proper thing to do.

Commissioner RAUM. Can you confer it by law?

Mr. HOLMAN. Yes, sir; you can confer any authority of removal of a bureau or department.

Commissioner RAUM. It is not exercised by any head of a bureau in the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not at this time desiring to pass upon the impropriety or the propriety of this proviso, but it has been suggested to the committee, and I would like to know from the Commissioner in the event such authority could be lawfully conferred, whether in his judgment it would promote the efficiency and expedite the work of that Bureau?

Commissioner RAUM. Well, the Bureau of Pensions is the biggest bureau of the Government, employing over 2,000 people there. To maintain the discipline in that force the Commissioner requires the most prompt and decided support on the part of the Department, and it might be better in connection with that office, as it is in con-

nection with the Patent Office, that appointments and removals should be made upon the recommendation of a head of a bureau.

Mr. HOLMAN. Practically that is the case now, I suppose. The appointments are made and removals are made upon the recommendation of the Commissioner.

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir; Gen. Bussey, who is present here now, and is Assistant Secretary, having charge of this matter, can tell you that there is a procession of people moving to his office all the while from the Pension Office in regard to various matters in connection with appointments, removals, and promotions—not so much promotions now as formerly. There is a great desire on the part of public men, and very often on the part of the employés, to supersede the views and recommendations of the Commissioner.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you approve or disapprove of this provision?

Commissioner RAUM. I should say it would be a wise thing to have the appointments and removals made upon the recommendation of the Commissioner of Pensions.

Mr. HOLMAN. These special examiners are \$1,400 people, I believe?

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir; and \$3 a day.

Mr. HOLMAN. When you send clerks out into the field they are paid how much? What class of clerks do you send?

Commissioner RAUM. Sometimes they are \$1,000 people and sometimes \$1,200 clerks and sometimes \$1,400 clerks. They rarely ever have gone into the field at \$1,600 a year salary.

Mr. HOLMAN. They range between \$1,000 and \$1,400?

Commissioner RAUM. Yes, sir; there are a few cases here and there, but it rarely ever happens.

Gen. BUSSEY. You might state that an order requiring all men in the field should be reduced to \$1,400 has been issued. We made an order requiring the special examiners in the field be all reduced to \$1,400 and we pay them \$3 a day extra. We require they shall be \$1,400 clerks if they remain in the field. I made that order myself.

Mr. HOLMAN. They are all on the same footing?

Gen. BUSSEY. Yes, sir.

SUBTREASURY AT ST. LOUIS, MO.

STATEMENT OF HON. S. W. COBB, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI.

The CHAIRMAN. You may state in your own way what you desire, Mr. Cobb.

Mr. COBB. I will only detain you gentlemen a minute, Mr. Chairman, and it is simply to call the attention of the committee to the report from the subtreasury at St. Louis, sent to me and by me referred to the Secretary of the Treasury and by him referred to your honorable committee asking for additional help and an increased compensation of clerks in the subtreasury at St. Louis. In that paper, Mr. Chairman, the matter is clearly put before the committee as to the discrepancy and injustice done the subtreasury in the city of St. Louis compared with other subtreasuries in the United States. We ask an increase of force, and I know of my own knowledge, gentlemen, that the force there is overworked, as you will readily see from the amount of business and the limited help they have. The subtreasury asks for an increased force of 3 men only, and then they ask for a raise of salary. If we can not get the latter, we would certainly like to have an increase of force.

I would state to the committee this as one comparison with the subtreasury at San Francisco, that in 1891 the subtreasury at San Francisco did a business of \$68,000,000, and the expenses of running that office was \$27,120. In the same year the subtreasury at St. Louis—and they have a mint there also which relieves them of some work—handled \$101,000,000 at the expense of clerical hire of \$19,080, showing you a very great injustice done that office, and the same comparison will almost hold good of any other subtreasury of the United States. We feel that it should have some relief. For instance, the salaries and expenses of the San Francisco office, the expenses, rather, of that office might be cut down and added to the office at St. Louis, and it might be done without an increase of expenditures on the part of the Government.

I will not detain you, gentlemen, as the whole matter is very clearly and very forcibly stated in this paper which is before your committee from Gen. Farrar, in which a comparison is made with the San Francisco and other subtreasuries of the United States, and you will see that we do the business of that office in a far less per cent than any other in the United States; and we feel we should have this additional help in the office, and we think you should either raise the salaries or reduce the others, and add something to us.

You can, without any injustice, it seems to me, cut down some of the expenses of

running the subtreasury at San Francisco, where there is such a great discrepancy, and give us some relief even from that source. If you refer to the paper of Gen. Farrar you will see there is a comparison made of all the other subtreasuries in the United States, and you have only to glance at it to see the justice of the claim we have before the committee. We want 3 additional men, an assistant teller, an assistant bookkeeper, and a porter. Those are all that we ask for. The expenditures for these three people will be \$4,900, and that added to the \$19,080 would only make \$23,980 instead of \$19,080.

Mr. HOLMAN. We will try to look into that.

Mr. COBB. I wish you would, and you will see the justice of it.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE H. SHIELDS, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

The CHAIRMAN. Governor Dingley will please conduct the examination.

Mr. DINGLEY. Now, will you please state whether or not, in view of the reduction of the work in the Land Office, caused by the legislation of 1891, there can be any reduction of the force of your office without any injury to the public service in your Department?

Mr. SHIELDS. Well, I am rather inclined to think there ought not to be a reduction made, and I can give you in my last report to the Secretary the status of it, which would lead you to form your own judgment. We have there 16 lawyers, 1 editor, 4 stenographers, and 2 messengers. The 2 messengers are absolutely necessary, because we are constantly having to send to the Land Office to find out about the status of the records. Last year we disposed of 1,943 docket cases up to November 1, and since then we have disposed of 362 cases, which makes 2,305 which we have disposed of, beginning January 1, 1892. Those are docket cases.

In addition to the docket cases the Assistant Attorney-General's office disposes of an immense amount of miscellaneous work, which includes railroad adjustments, the examination of reservoir and canal plats, claims by States for swamp-land indemnity, motions for review, applications for certiorari, for suits to vacate patents and applications for surveys, reports on bills pending in Congress, answers to letters of inquiry in regard to the business of the office, the examination and preparation of instructions to the Land Office, instructions construing statutes pertaining to the general legal business of the Land Office and this Department. And in addition to that we have the Indian Office, and during the fiscal year 1892 we disposed of 2,297 docket cases, 167 reviews, and 1,344 miscellaneous, and that includes the line which I have just mentioned to you, and in addition to that there were 134 opinions rendered on subjects which were referred to us by the Secretary. Whenever any legal question arises and the Secretary is in doubt (and being a lawyer he sees a legal question quicker than a man who is not a lawyer would) he refers it to us for opinion. There are now pending about 2,000 cases, just about the same number pending this time last year.

I will give you in a moment the status of the business of the office. At the end of an administration every fellow who is defeated thinks he will stand some show under a review the next time, and the result was we fell behind about two months more when I came into the office, but latterly we did business with greater celerity and were catching up. In fact, you know as you become more familiar with a business you can do the business with greater celerity. When I came into the office we were about eleven months behind. About June, I think, we had fallen behind about fourteen months. We have now caught up until we are only seven months behind, but the amount of business the office has to do for this coming year will be fully as great for this current year, in my judgment, as any year since I have been in the office.

Mr. HOLMAN. What has been the effect of the act of the 3d of March, 1891?

Mr. SHIELDS. It has not been appreciable in our office yet, because we have been so far behind.

Mr. HOLMAN. But it will have an effect in the future?

Mr. SHIELDS. I think it will in the future, and after this year I have not the slightest doubt there may be a very decided reduction, but I do not think it will be to the interest of the service that it should be done this year.

Mr. HOLMAN. I notice in 1887 the appropriation for this Bureau was \$20,700, and in 1888 it was \$30,700, and in 1889 it was \$36,700, the same in 1890, and in 1891 it was \$36,950. How has that increase occurred?

Mr. SHIELDS. In 1887, on the recommendation either of Secretary Vilas or, I think, probably Secretary Lamar, there was an addition made to the force of five or six clerks. The clerks got \$2,000 a year, and in 1891 there was an addition made of one

stenographer, who really attends to the business, the personal dictation of the Assistant Attorney-General, and one editor; that accounts for the difference in the appropriation. You know we publish all our decisions which are important, because they are very far-reaching, and they practically pay for themselves as far as the printing and that sort of thing is concerned. As far as the salary as the men is concerned, the editor's salary is \$2,250. I think I can say that my force is composed more with regard to the efficiency of a man than his political status, and I think I can say all of them are good, energetic, faithful, hard-working lawyers.

Mr. HOLMAN. How soon will the effect of the act of March 3, 1891, be seen?

Mr. SHIELDS. We are just beginning to get appeals now. We have disposed of a great number of appeals by advancing them on the docket where it can be done; but, on the other side, we are beginning to get the Oklahoma business in now, and there is quite an amount of them growing out of the Oklahoma opening and those Indian openings down there.

Mr. HOLMAN. Notwithstanding there is a large number of cases on your docket, as a matter of fact, I suppose sometimes a single decision disposed of a great many cases?

Mr. SHIELDS. Yes, sir; very frequently. Sometimes a decision will dispose of fifty cases; but lawyers who are beaten below do not always think their cases are exactly the same kind as that which has been decided, and they appeal, and we have to take the cases up and examine and dispose of them.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM M. STONE, COMMISSIONER OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE.

The CHAIRMAN. Judge Holman will please conduct the examination with reference to the General Land Office.

Mr. HOLMAN. What is the present state of your office as to your business?

Mr. STONE. Well, I will take the contest division, which is one of the most important ones in the bureau and I will give you the status of that. I have had a full examination made of that bureau recently and I find that within the next ten or fifteen days that the work, progressing as it is now, will be to what we call the current business of the office; that is, it will be up as nearly as it is practical for it ever to be, and I will explain what I mean by that.

For instance, the chief of division takes the cases and assigns Mr. Smith so many cases and Mr. Brown so many cases, and while they are working them off there comes in from the local land office more business. We can not ever be up in this division nearer than probably sixty days. We can not send the cases to patent until the sixty days are expired, as sixty days are allowed for appeal. These cases are assigned to these law examiners. There are ten of them. Now, I have taken the different classes of clerks there after a careful examination of the office, and what I have said generally about the contest division you will find in all of them. Then we have two law clerks who are allowed by act of Congress—

Mr. HOLMAN. In addition to the ten?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir; and they get \$2,200 a year salary, and that makes \$4,400. Then there are two other clerks, called law examiners, who get \$2,000, which makes \$4,000, and we could not dispense with them. Now, there are eleven chiefs of division—

Mr. HOLMAN. Let us see, there are ten law examiners—

Mr. STONE. I will get to that in a minute. I call them principal examiners. There are eleven chiefs of division, and they get \$2,000, which is \$22,000. Until the divisions are reduced we can not get along without chiefs, you know, for every division has to have a head. Then there is one recorder, who gets a salary of \$2,000. There must always be a recorder.

Mr. HOLMAN. Have you ten chiefs whose salaries are fixed by law?

Mr. STONE. There are eleven divisions and each division has a chief.

Mr. HOLMAN. And their salaries are fixed by law at \$2,000?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir. Last session Congress raised them from \$1,800 to \$2,000. Now there are ten principal examiners. These examiners are lawyers, and every case has to go through their hands. There are ten of them, and we could not get along without them, and I will tell you why. This bill after it passed, opening the Cherokee Strip, involving 6,000,000 acres of land, will increase the business of the office, and while we are getting rid of the business rapidly yet other Indian territory that is added to the public domain adds a material increase to the work of the Land Office. Strange as it may seem, a large number, the majority of these cases (homestead cases) are contested. There are men who follow the business of contesting homesteaders, and, of course, many are contestees in good faith; but every contest

adds to the amount of business and labor of these ten examiners. They all pass through their hands, and I can not estimate any reduction of those.

Mr. HOLMAN. What connection have these law clerks with the Assistant Attorney-General, any?

Mr. STONE. My law examiners do not. My law examiners examine a case, and if they approve of the division letter, why, they insert it, and if they do not they put a note on it showing wherein they differ; and then we settle that difference as to whether the notes are correct on the original letter sent up, and then either party can appeal to the Secretary, and it goes through Gen. Shields's hands and—

Mr. HOLMAN. And the Attorney-General virtually decides the matter?

Mr. STONE. It passes through his hands, every case that is appealed, and there are certain unappealed cases that go up; but every case that is appealed has to go through Gen. Shields's hands. He is the law chief of the Department.

Mr. HOLMAN. Now, you can proceed in your own order.

Mr. STONE. I guess I have answered your question. I have 32 clerks of class 4, \$1,800, at a total of \$57,600. I recommend that we can get along with 2 less and instead of 32 I would put 30. I have not any doubt about that at all. Now, I have of class 3, \$1,600 62, and I recommend that 6 can be dropped off the next fiscal year. Now, I have 72 in class 2, \$1,400, making an aggregate of \$100,800, and I recommend there a reduction of 14. I am sure that can be done without any detriment to the public service. I have 78 of class 1, \$1,200, at an aggregate salary of \$123,600, and I recommend the reduction of 20. I want you to understand I have been over this thoroughly.

Mr. HOLMAN. Is this the result largely of the legislation of 1891?

Mr. STONE. It is, largely.

Mr. HOLMAN. I supposed so.

Mr. STONE. There have been a great many hundred cases—I can not tell the number, because I did not expect I would be called on for that—that have passed out under the act of March 3, 1891.

Mr. HOLMAN. I took it for granted that that was so.

Mr. STONE. I doubt the propriety of the construction the Secretary put upon it. I think it was an unfortunate construction, but he is a bigger man than I am and I do not wish to criticise him. I, however, do not think it is correct. Well, Secretary Chandler is more responsible than Secretary Noble. Secretary Noble and I agree, I think, that the construction which Secretary Chandler, who is a good lawyer and who did it in good faith, put upon it was not—

Mr. HOLMAN. Before the conferees met the Senate had adjourned, and it was done in a hurry and no member of the conference committee understood that that was to be the construction.

Mr. STONE. No matter how fraudulent an entry, if it is passed into the hands of the transferee, if we can not show he had knowledge of the fraud it goes on, and that is wrong. The rule heretofore has been, since the Land Office was organized, in 1812; that a man who purchased from a man stood in his shoes, and that ought to be the rule to protect the public domain, because it is often that the transferee has knowledge of the whole thing, but you can not prove it.

Mr. DINGLEY. I think almost always the transferee understands the whole thing.

Mr. STONE. I think so, in seventy-five cases out of a hundred.

Now, of the \$1,000 class we have 56, and I recommend a reduction of 16 there. We have 55 copyists at \$900, making \$44,500, and I recommend that 10 be dropped. We have 21 transcribers at \$600, making \$12,600, and I recommend that 5 be dropped. That makes a reduction of \$84,800 in the money needed. In all, I have 402 clerks, and that makes a total reduction in the clerical force of \$84,800.

Mr. HOLMAN. One other matter. Suppose that Congress should provide for dispensing with special examiners—special agents you send out?

Mr. STONE. You mean in the field?

Mr. HOLMAN. Yes, sir; and authorize a detail from your Bureau. How would that affect this arrangement?

Mr. STONE. Well, my opinion is, we have so many timber cases away out on the coast in Washington, and in California, and Nevada, and everywhere, and if we depended upon sending special examiners from the office it would reduce the force too much. If you reduce it as I recommend it we can find employment for all the clerks. Occasionally there is a peculiar case which arises, and they want a brainy, bright fellow from the Department to go out and examine it; but if we send a clerk out it will reduce the force and put us behind, and it is better to have men in the field. We have had as high as eighty-five special agents out on special services, such as with regard to the destruction of timber, fraudulent entries, etc. Under the appropriation at the last session of Congress for this fiscal year we had to cut them down, and we have discharged about 40.

The CHAIRMAN. How many have you retained?

Mr. STONE. I think we have about 31 or 32. I have not counted them.

Mr. HOLMAN. What salaries do you pay them?

Mr. STONE. We have paid salaries from \$1,200, \$1,400 to \$1,500, and a per diem allowance of \$3 for expenses. Now, then, I am satisfied that the business in the field, all special work in the field, can be done by 40 instead of 80. I am getting along very well now and I have only got about 31 or 32.

Mr. HOLMAN. You say you have 40 now?

Mr. STONE. I think it is reduced down to about 31 or 32, and I think 40 would be ample instead of an appropriation for 80.

Mr. HOLMAN. Entries and all that kind of thing under the act of 1891 is largely disposed of?

Mr. STONE. You are right about that, and we made a drop of about 40.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand the sundry civil bill, as reported to the House, makes a reduction in the appropriation for special agents from \$120,000 to \$40,000. Now, then, do you make this estimated reduction in view of the action already had in the sundry civil bill?

Mr. STONE. No, I do not know that it is upon my suggestion. I think the Secretary would concur with me, although I have not talked with him about it.

Mr. HOLMAN. Under the action of the last session of Congress did you detail any of your clerks?

Mr. STONE. We sent a man named Clark out the other day to look at an important matter in California, in timber entries, which are alleged to be fraudulent. I do not know a man in the field whom I would trust as soon as Clark. It does not cost anything except his traveling expenses, in addition to his salary.

Mr. HOLMAN. Is that the only detail you have made?

Mr. STONE. Now, then, I do not know of another clerk that we have got out in the field making special examinations. There may possibly be one in Montana, I do not know now. I think possibly Jecko is an agent in the field, and if so, he is the only one except Clark.

Mr. HOLMAN. You have only about 32 now?

Mr. STONE. I think about 32. I can give you the exact number when I get back, but I should say now there are about 32 special examiners.

Mr. HOLMAN. You know the Western Senators are very much inclined to strike out all that provision?

Mr. STONE. Well, there is a prejudice against the special agent. I want to tell you how that is. You get a special agent in the field, suppose in California, if he is a good man who will do his duty properly they will raise a public clamor and they will go to their Senators and Representatives and you will get telegrams asking for this man's removal, and you do not want to remove him if he does his duty.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to complete a question begun a moment ago. A reduction has been made, I understand, in the sundry civil bill which contemplates the entire abolition of special agents. Now, in view of that reduction do you submit this additional estimated reduction?

Mr. STONE. I will tell you—I will answer your questions in this way, Mr. Chairman. I think that there ought to be not less than thirty agents in the field. This is a great country and there are various kinds of entries and I do not think the Land Office could get along and do its duty to the public with less than thirty agents, if they are carefully selected to protect the public interest. There are a great many frauds in timber entries. Great mill-owners—lumbermen—get a big tract, and through their agents, not themselves, sometimes frauds are committed on the public domain and we have got to send agents out, and there have been fraudulent surveys and we have to have them in the field.

The CHAIRMAN. I now call your attention to page 108, to the item, "for per diem in lieu of subsistence of inspectors and of clerks detailed to investigate fraudulent land entries, trespasses on the public lands, and cases of official misconduct, etc." I understand provision has been made in the sundry civil bill which covers substantially that appropriation. What about that?

Mr. STONE. I think that is fair and right. We have got to have several new land offices; some in the Cherokee Strip and in the Indian Territory.

Mr. HOLMAN. But we have provided in the sundry civil bill for a pretty severe reduction of land offices?

Mr. STONE. I know.

Mr. HOLMAN. I do not know whether the Senate will agree to it or not.

Mr. STONE. Of course, our business is being disposed of, and the area of the public domain is being reduced, but these are new additions to the business, and a majority of their cases will be contested.

Mr. HOLMAN. How many of these inspectors are there?

Mr. STONE. There are thirty-two left—you mean agents?

Mr. HOLMAN. No; "for per diem in lieu of subsistence of inspectors;" there are only two inspectors there.

Mr. STONE. There are more than that, but how many I do not know until I look.

Mr. HOLMAN. Special land inspectors?

Mr. STONE. We have quite a number.

Mr. HOLMAN. But what I am calling attention to is on page 107, "for per diem in lieu of subsistence of inspectors." Now, what are the duties of these special land inspectors?

Mr. STONE. To do whatever we order them to do.

Mr. HOLMAN. Can not you dispense with them; they are not connected with your office?

Mr. STONE. They belong to the Secretary, and he orders them here and there.

Mr. HOLMAN. They occupy exactly the same position as Indian inspectors?

Mr. STONE. I suppose so. I know a man named Habberson was appointed by the Commissioner, and he has had quite an amount of work.

Mr. HOLMAN. What do they do?

Mr. STONE. They go around wherever there is a hitch.

The CHAIRMAN. Turn to page 121 of the bill, relating to surveyors-general. A recent statute provided for a salary of \$2,000 for the surveyors-general of North Dakota and South Dakota. Do you know why the surveyors-general in other States and Territories should have a salary greater than \$2,000?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir; I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. Why?

Mr. STONE. Because there is more unsurveyed land.

The CHAIRMAN. In what State?

Mr. STONE. Take Arizona Territory and New Mexico, where there is a great body of land unsurveyed, and there is a constant demand for surveys there.

The CHAIRMAN. In that connection what do you say of the consolidation of the surveyors-general of Minnesota, the two Dakotas, California, Nevada, and Utah?

Mr. STONE. Well, I do not see why it can not be done. You see the great bulk of the land has been surveyed, and I do not see why that should not be done, and I should say we could. You know they contract for surveying it out. They do not do the surveying themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. For the surveyor-general of Arizona, do you think his salary ought to be \$2,500, where the surveyors-general of North and South Dakota only receive \$2,000?

Mr. STONE. I think there is much difference in the amount of work.

The CHAIRMAN. What would you say as to the salary of the surveyor-general of California?

Mr. STONE. There is a great deal of unsurveyed land in California.

The CHAIRMAN. How does it compare with the unsurveyed land in North and South Dakota?

Mr. STONE. It is larger. I should think there was more unsurveyed land in California than in both Dakotas. That is my guess about it.

The CHAIRMAN. How about the State of Idaho?

Mr. STONE. That is a State that has not been favored by surveys, and there is a great deal of work to be done there.

The CHAIRMAN. How about Montana?

Mr. STONE. The same way.

The CHAIRMAN. Oregon?

Mr. STONE. Well, about the same; there is a vast amount of land there that has not been surveyed, and I could not recommend any reduction.

The CHAIRMAN. Utah; what would you say as to that?

Mr. STONE. Utah has a vast amount of territory unsurveyed.

The CHAIRMAN. What is it; arid land?

Mr. STONE. Yes, arid land; and of course the mountains were not surveyed. We are surveying all the arid lands as fast as we can get at it with money appropriated for it. The foothills they survey there, and lands all along the streams, Bear River, etc. There is a great deal of arid land in Utah that is not surveyed.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I want to call your attention to the provision contained on page 43 of the sundry civil bill reported to the House, and I ask you to take that provision with you to your office and in the light of its requirements, which I understand abolishes the entire force of special agents, submit an estimate as to the reduction you can make in the Land Office?

Mr. STONE. In other words, Mr. Chairman, let me put it the other way; let me make an estimate of the amount that will be needed. We have been reducing so that I had better suggest to you the number needed.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to know, in view of that provision which abolishes the entire force of special agents, what reduction of the force you estimate in the General Land Office?

Mr. STONE. That is, over the appropriation for this fiscal year, you mean?

The CHAIRMAN. Our committee have recommended that provision to which I have called your attention and you must assume that as the judgment of the committee.

Now, then, in view of that reduction abolishing the entire force of special agents, which recommendation you had no knowledge of until this morning, will you kindly submit to the committee an estimate of the reduction you can make in your office, and do so at the earliest possible moment?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir.

Memorandum.

Grade.	Number clerks now em- ployed.	Total salaries.	Reduc- tion.	Saving.
Law clerks.....	2	\$4,400	None.
Law examiners.....	2	4,000	do
Chiefs of division.....	11	22,000	do
Recorder.....	1	2,000	do
Principal examiners.....	10	20,000	do
Class 4 (\$1,800).....	32	57,600	2	\$3,600
Class 3 (\$1,600).....	62	89,600	6	9,600
Class 2 (\$1,400).....	72	100,800	14	19,600
Class 1 (\$1,200).....	78	123,600	20	24,000
Class \$1,000.....	56	56,000	16	16,000
Copyists (\$900).....	55	44,500	10	4,000
Transcribers (\$600).....	21	12,000	5	3,000
Totals.....	402			84,800

OFFICE OF STANDARD WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS C. MENDENHALL.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you turn to page 52 of the printed bill and tell us what necessity there is for an appropriation for "Expenses of the attendance of the American member of the International Committee on Weights and Measures at the general conference provided for in the convention of May 20, 1875, etc.?"

Mr. MENDENHALL. This appropriation has been one that has been made for many years, the first appropriation being in 1877, and from that time to the present there has always been a delegate from America to this International Committee. The International Bureau of Weights and Measures is an institution which is sustained by the union of some twenty-five or thirty—I do not remember the precise number—of all the nations of the world contributing annually, in accordance with their population, to the expenses of this bureau, which is altogether not large, for the purpose of the consideration of and distribution of standard weights and measures to all these nations, and there has, as I say, been an American delegate. In fact, before this convention of 1875 there were American delegates to the preliminary conference.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you send them now?

Prof. MENDENHALL. Yes, sir; we do.

The CHAIRMAN. Will one be present next year?

Prof. MENDENHALL. I will come to that if you will pardon me, because I want to be a little full, as I want to explain all the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all we want to know. You will send one the next fiscal year?

Prof. MENDENHALL. I can not tell you, because I have no knowledge—I have nothing to do with the sending of this delegate.

The CHAIRMAN. Who does that?

Prof. MENDENHALL. He is appointed by the President of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any expenditure under that clause this year?

Prof. MENDENHALL. Yes, sir; I have here a list of the expenditures under this head for the last six fiscal years.

The CHAIRMAN. What are they, will you file that with the clerk?

Prof. MENDENHALL. The highest expenditure is \$469.89. During the year 1891 the delegate did not attend and during the year 1888 he did not attend. It sometimes arises there is no business of importance to demand his presence.

The CHAIRMAN. That, you think, represents the maximum cost?

Prof. MENDENHALL. The highest expense has been for the present fiscal year, which is \$469.89, and that is the highest amount that has been paid.

The CHAIRMAN. \$475 would be ample?

Mr. MENDENHALL. \$475 is more than we have ever yet paid.

*Statement of expenses of American member International Committee—contingent expenses—
Standard Weights and Measures.*

Year.	Name.	For what paid.	Amount.
1888			
1889	B. A. Gould	Traveling expenses...	\$463. 29
1890	do	do	467. 64
1891			
1892	B. A. Gould	Traveling expenses...	416. 73
1893	do	do	469. 89

SUBTREASURY AT NEW ORLEANS.

**STATEMENT OF E. G. DASKAM, CHIEF OF DIVISION OF PUBLIC
MONEYS, TREASURY DEPARTMENT.**

The CHAIRMAN. What is the necessity for the increased force you ask for at the New Orleans mint?

Mr. DASKAM. The New Orleans assistant treasurer asked for it because of extra labor in the redemption of silver and shipment of it at that particular mint. It is just simply solid work. They do not want high-priced clerks, but they want more help.

The CHAIRMAN. What kind of help?

Mr. DASKAM. They ask for a shipping clerk and one clerk without giving him any particular designation.

The CHAIRMAN. What do they do, simply put up money?

Mr. DASKAM. Put up money and verify it as it comes in for redemption. It is a pretty good day's work to handle \$20,000 in silver and count it piece by piece, and it takes one clerk all the time and then he can not keep it up.

The CHAIRMAN. Why can not you use lower-grade clerks?

Mr. DASKAM. Twelve hundred dollars is a low price for anybody in a responsible position handling actual money.

The CHAIRMAN. What increased work is imposed upon that office?

Mr. DASKAM. The shipment of silver.

The CHAIRMAN. Shipment where?

Mr. DASKAM. Direct from the mint instead of the subtreasury.

The CHAIRMAN. Direct from the mint; how does that impose extra duty on the assistant treasurer?

Mr. DASKAM. It does not, but they are out of silver coin at the mint, so they have to go to the subtreasury.

The CHAIRMAN. Where is it shipped to?

Mr. DASKAM. Any point that it is asked for, I reckon.

The CHAIRMAN. From what point have they been heretofore shipping?

Mr. DASKAM. Under the regulations they ship from the nearest subtreasury to the point to which it is to be shipped. There is a large demand around New Orleans.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the demand greater than it has been heretofore?

Mr. DASKAM. Yes, sir; fully as great.

The CHAIRMAN. Why can not they ship from the mint as heretofore?

Mr. DASKAM. Because they have not a dollar left.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it in contemplation of the Director of the Mint to coin silver dollars there?

Mr. DASKAM. All in the mint there were coined under the act of July, 1890, and we are obliged to hold them, and those coined under the act of 1878 have been shipped, and now it is a physical impossibility for them to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. How about the clerical force in the mint; does not that involve a reduction of the clerical force at the mint?

Mr. DASKAM. I can not tell you about that.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, the decrease of the work of the mint ought to amount to a decrease in the force there?

Mr. DASKAM. A decrease of the shipment at the mint and an increase of shipment at the subtreasury.

The CHAIRMAN. That should operate to decrease the force at the mint and increase the force at the subtreasury.

COMMISSIONER OF RAILROADS.

STATEMENT OF H. A. TAYLOR, COMMISSIONER OF RAILROADS.

Mr. HOLMAN. This bill has carried for a good many years the items which are still here?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir; the only variation has been in the estimate for expenses.

Mr. HOLMAN. Now, there is an engineer at \$2,500. Will you tell us the duties performed by that officer?

Mr. TAYLOR. He goes over the so-called subsidized railroads. He is supposed to do so annually, although he does not go over all of them; but he goes of course carefully over all the bonded railroads and makes an inspection of their tracks, the buildings and equipments, machine shops, and everything connected with the physical organization and operation of the roads, and he makes such suggestions to the companies as occur to him.

The CHAIRMAN. His examinations are not confined entirely to the Union Pacific system?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; the law requires all the subsidized railroads, all subsidized railroads coming under the jurisdiction of the Railroad Bureau; that is, if the railroads have received anything from the Government in the way of bonds, money, or land or anything else; we pay special attention to the bonded roads.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will you state the benefit to the Government of this inspection? They have their own engineers, of course?

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, I do not know but that I should prefer somebody else should say in regard to this. The theory, I suppose is, the Government gave money and land in aid of the construction of these roads and they ought to see they are properly constructed and maintained for the public safety, and to that end Government supervision is perhaps necessary. You know the tendency in the West in sparsely settled regions is to let the railroad equipment run down to a pretty poor condition, sometimes where it is hardly safe to travel over, and I suppose the theory is for the Government to supervise and require it to be kept in better order.

Mr. HOLMAN. The attention of Congress has never been called, I believe, to any necessary action?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, sir; I do not think so. In the main, the railroads themselves will do this. The engineer has found occasion to suggest that they have better rails; that the tracks should be improved, curves should be improved, and ballast put in certain places, and sometimes attention of their engineers has been called to bridges which were thought not to be as safe as they should be, or some such thing as that.

Mr. HOLMAN. Are not these matters you speak of special concern to the railroads themselves?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir; of much more importance to them than anybody else.

Mr. HOLMAN. Really, the office could be dispensed with without any injury to the public service?

Mr. TAYLOR. I suppose the same reason exists for its continuance now that existed before the organization of it.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your opinion? I want you to give the committee the benefit of your opinion. You have had the office for four years and you ought to know.

Mr. TAYLOR. My opinion is that the Government will not suffer specially.

The CHAIRMAN. To abolish the whole Bureau?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not think it would suffer seriously.

The CHAIRMAN. You think there is no necessity for it?

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, there is this about it. There is nowhere in the country now any bureau, any place, where anything can be found out with reference to the relation of these roads to the Government as far as their duties are concerned except that office, and there is this much about it—that the railroads never pay over to anybody any more than they have to pay, and they are liable to pay less.

The CHAIRMAN. If this Bureau is abolished, to what Bureau would you suggest these papers be turned over?

Mr. HOLMAN. That would be the Treasury office, of course.

Mr. TAYLOR. We have to keep accounts with the railroad companies. In the first place, we have to ascertain how much they owe the Government and what they should pay, and out of that we credit them with all payments they make, interest on bonds, interest account, and all that sort of thing. Of course that could be done by bookkeepers probably in the Interior Department or the Treasury Department or elsewhere.

Mr. HOLMAN. It is done now in the Treasury Department; they make reports to the Treasury?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; I report to the Secretary of the Interior. I do not have any-

thing to do with the Treasury. The Treasury Department reports to me all moneys. For instance, they report the money paid in for a railroad company, whether it goes into the bond, interest accounts, sinking fund, etc., and when a certain fund is paid in the Secretary of the Treasury invests this money and purchases bonds, and so on, and at certain times he makes a report, monthly, to my office of his transactions, of what has been paid in to him, and what investments have been made by him, and all that.

Mr. HOLMAN. What is the benefit of that?

Mr. TAYLOR. There is a great benefit in knowing all the business. They can find out how they stand. They do not know in the Treasury how much these roads should pay over to the Government. The roads do not report to the Treasury, except they send their bills there for transportation; but if you want to ascertain how much these bonded roads owe the Government you have to come to this Bureau; there is no record in the Treasury Department.

Mr. HOLMAN. Do you think one clerk would be all that is sufficient?

Mr. TAYLOR. I believe a bookkeeper should be employed, because the duties of the bookkeeper's office are to inspect the books of the company. You have to go and look over their books and see whether the accounts are properly made out; whether certain items are charged in their accounts. The law requires they shall pay 25 per cent of the net earnings, and you have to go and see how their accounts are made out.

Mr. HOLMAN. And that requires the services of a bookkeeper?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is what the bookkeepers do.

The CHAIRMAN. That duty should be devolved upon the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary of the Interior—which?

Mr. TAYLOR. Either, I suppose. It could be devolved upon them on a detail of clerks to perform that business, instead of having it done.

Mr. HOLMAN. One competent bookkeeper could perform all the duty, I suppose?

Mr. TAYLOR. I should hardly say that. In the first place, he has got to visit the principal railroad headquarters, Boston, New York, Omaha, San Francisco, wherever they have headquarters, and go through their books, and I could not say that one man could do it.

Mr. HOLMAN. Of late years there has been no real issue between your Bureau and the Union Pacific system?

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, yes; we have had very heavy issues; and when I came into my office, for some reason best known to himself, my predecessor, Gen. Johnston, had made no demand whatever upon the railroad companies, but had simply made a report of what they reported to him, and I investigated the matter and I ascertained, as I thought, that there was a large amount of money due the Government that they had held back. One item was \$450,000 for earnings on sleeping and dining cars. They said they did not regard that as coming under the law. Then, again, the earnings of the Omaha Bridge were very large. No bonds were really issued from Omaha to Council Bluffs, whereas the act of Congress required the road to begin at Council Bluffs; but it did not begin there, but began at Omaha. Then they got another act of Congress allowing them to issue certain bonds and build from Omaha across the Missouri River to Council Bluffs, and they claim that was a nonaided line. I claimed that under the act of Congress they were obliged to begin at Council Bluffs, and—

Mr. HOLMAN. What was the result of that?

Mr. TAYLOR. The result was they said they would pay under protest, and did so; but they did not think it was right.

The CHAIRMAN. How much did they pay?

Mr. TAYLOR. And then there was an item for pay for running sleeping and dining cars in company with the Pullman Company, the Union Pacific owning three-fifths and the Pullman Company owning two-fifths. I wanted reports from them of their earnings on those cars, and they said that was no part of railroading; that it was hotel-keeping, and that I had no more right to call on them for earnings from these cars than I had for earnings at an eating-house; but I did not agree with them. I claimed when the eating was done in an eating-house on wheels it became part of the railroad equipment, and we have always charged it up to them the same as any other.

Mr. HOLMAN. Gen. Johnston, as a rule, simply reported to the Secretary of the Interior what was reported to him?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir; that is all. I think the sensible proposition, which is not in the line of my duty, is to abolish the railroad committees and settle with the railroad companies. The bonds issued in aid of these railroads will begin to mature in the next Congress, and I have recommended and devoted my time and attention more than anything else to try to induce Congress to pass some bill which will settle with those people. We have got to do something with them.

Mr. HOLMAN. That has been your principal duty, except in regard to that bridge matter and the Pullman car business?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am called upon for many things all the time. Men want reports about this and that thing, and the War Department wants to know about what rates they should pay to these roads, and all that sort of thing. I was called upon for a report by the Pan-American Congress, which was embodied bodily in their report of the roads of the United States. I have not been overburdened; I have not worked over ten hours a day; I will say that but I have done everything the law required to be done as well as I could do it.

Mr. HOLMAN. I think you have performed the duties of the office first rate, but I complain certainly of Gen. Johnston.

Mr. TAYLOR. As I tell you, what the general did is not in controversy, and I did all I thought ought to be done, and my main object was and has been to impress upon individual members of Congress the necessity of settling this while we can get the money out of them, which I think we can.

Mr. HOLMAN. There is great diversity of opinion on this point over the country. One singular fact about that bill is that in the Forty-eighth and Forty-ninth Congresses that bill came to the previous question on its final passage and it never moved a peg.

Mr. DINGLEY. The duties of your office are confined almost entirely to this matter of the aided roads?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir; we regard that as of more importance than any of the others.

Mr. DINGLEY. Do the roads report statistics to you and do you publish them?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir; they report all their business.

Mr. DINGLEY. There are some statistics reported to the Interstate Commerce Commission; are these duplicated?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; they are not duplicated. Of course, there are some facts they report to both—that is, in regard to mileage, amount of new construction, and that sort of thing—but the Interstate Commerce Commission, you know, relates almost wholly to rates of traffic, while my office has nothing whatever to do with rates of traffic.

The CHAIRMAN. Do not you think that a commissioner, at a salary of \$3,000, and a bookkeeper would discharge all the duties required by law?

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, you would have to have a copyist—a stenographer.

The CHAIRMAN. I desire your opinion about this matter, because you have been in office four years. We have no criticism to offer, but we ask you to state just what force can fairly discharge the duties devolving upon that bureau by law?

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, it cannot be reduced much, because the force is very small now. If you are going to abolish it, I have told you what were the duties devolving upon the engineer, and if you conclude it is not essential to have an engineer, and abolish him, that is one man who is removed. Then there are only two bookkeepers, one clerk, and a stenographer and a messenger. If you are going to have the Commissioner you would have to have a stenographer, certainly, and a messenger, because a messenger is kept running on one thing and another a large share of the time. Then there are only two bookkeepers and a clerk left.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you have a bookkeeper at \$2,400, an engineer at \$2,500, an assistant bookkeeper at \$1,800, and a clerk of class 3, a copyist, and one assistant messenger; in all, \$14,420. Then you have \$1,600 for examining books, accounts, etc.

Mr. TAYLOR. Those are the expenses for visiting those places and inspecting roads. It was originally \$3,000.

The CHAIRMAN. That gives a total appropriation of \$16,020.

Mr. TAYLOR. This item of expense account was originally \$3,000, until I came in, and I reduced it to \$2,500, and this year I have used from \$1,400 to \$1,500 of that.

Mr. HOLMAN. Do you think if you employed a bookkeeper and a clerk under one of the assistant secretaries of the Interior they could perform all the duties of the office satisfactorily?

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, there would have to be a stenographer connected with that somewhere. This is all the force you have now, and if you see fit to abolish the bureau and put it in somewhere under the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary of the Interior you could employ two bookkeepers and a clerk and you could get along without the messenger, because you could use some other messenger; and if you abolish the engineer why, then, you would not have as much force as you have now, except the Commissioner; but you would need a stenographer.

Mr. HOLMAN. Well, the Assistant Secretary always has a stenographer?

Mr. TAYLOR. But you can not get the use of the Assistant Secretary's stenographer. They do not do work for others.

Mr. HOLMAN. If you put it under one of the assistant secretaries?

Mr. TAYLOR. And let him use his own stenographer?

Mr. HOLMAN. You have got a stenographer now.

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, yes.

Mr. HOLMAN. Where?

Mr. TAYLOR. The copyist acts as a stenographer.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the salary of the copyist?

Mr. TAYLOR. Nine hundred dollars.

Mr. HOLMAN. He is really a stenographer?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLMAN. Have you any doubt if this is put under one of the secretaries with two bookkeepers and a clerk that the business can be properly performed?

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, I think it could be, because you will have substantially the same force you have now, except you will dispense with the Commissioner and get rid of his salary, and you would have about the same working force. The Assistant Secretary would take the place of the Commissioner, and then you would have two bookkeepers and what you call a clerk. I should say you should have a stenographer, and then you will have force enough.

The CHAIRMAN. You will dispense with the Commissioner, the engineer, a clerk of class 3, and a messenger?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLMAN. If Congress does what is expected to be done—what I believe ought to be done—and the mortgage is foreclosed, this matter would not be of any great moment?

Mr. TAYLOR. As soon as Congress settles with the road or forecloses, of course there is no necessity for this office at all.

The CHAIRMAN. In regard to the second item there, suppose this duty should be devolved upon one of the assistant secretaries of the Interior and he be allowed two bookkeepers and a stenographer, as I understand it you think that can be done and the duties of the Bureau efficiently discharged. If that is true, would it require any appropriation for the examination of books and accounts of certain subsidized roads?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir; unless the Secretary of the Interior was allowed to pay it out of the funds he had there for traveling expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think \$1,000 will be ample for that?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir; and more too. I never spend over \$1,200 to \$1,500, including my own traveling expenses and the expenses of the engineer and bookkeepers, too.

The CHAIRMAN. What will be an ample appropriation for the expenses of the examination, etc.

Mr. TAYLOR. If you are going to have no inspection by the engineer and no traveling over the road by the Commissioner, but simply an examination of the books, \$500 would pay the expenses.

Mr. DINGLEY. You say if there is no engineer. What is your judgment respecting the necessity in the public interest of having an engineer perform this work of inspection?

Mr. TAYLOR. I have stated to the committee—I guess you were out at the time—that that is a question pretty hard to decide. I suppose the railroads would keep their tracks in pretty good order and trains run if they did not have any Government supervision, but whether or not they would keep their tracks in a little better order and the bridges safer by reason of the fact that the Government is going to send an engineer to inspect them and see whether they are in good condition, you can see as well as I can. I do not think the public would be greatly put in peril anyway.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is this all the inspection either of State or national authority, so far as supervision is concerned, the railroads receive. I mean either State or national authority.

Mr. TAYLOR. The national authority is to inspect their tracks, rolling stock, etc., and of course that implies everything—bridges and everything connected with the physical organization of the roads.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is there any other inspection except what is provided by the paragraph we are on now?

Mr. TAYLOR. None. I do not know but what some States may have a State inspection. I do not remember whether that is so or not, but I think one or two States do.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the mileage of these roads?

Mr. TAYLOR. The entire mileage of all the subsidized roads is fifty or sixty thousand miles.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think it is within the limit of the remotest possibility for one engineer to inspect it all?

Mr. TAYLOR. It is not, and he does not attempt to inspect all, but he inspects all the bonded roads.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the mileage of those roads?

Mr. TAYLOR. I should say about 14,000 miles.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think one man can make any sort of inspection of that mileage?

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, very easily.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the inspection?

Mr. TAYLOR. He takes a car, as a rule—

Mr. HOLMAN. Just as the president of the railroad does.

Mr. TAYLOR (continuing). He takes a private car and a locomotive and starts out, and sits on the end of an observation car and watches the track. Either the engineer or roadmaster or overseer of the section of the road goes with him as a detail to him, or a division superintendent. They go along with him and he says, "Well, that track ought to be ballasted a little better;" and as he goes around a curve he says, "I think that is a dangerous curve; see if you can not do something to it." He goes over a bridge and possibly sees something that ought to be done there.

Mr. DINGLEY. This man is a practical railroad engineer?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir; he goes through the shops and looks at the locomotives and the rolling stock, etc. Of course, the interest of the railroad company is to keep up its own road, as they are more interested than anybody else in that, and to have their tracks safe to obviate accidents and all that; and the assumption is they would do it, but the theory of Congress seemed to have been when this office was organized that it was better to have Government supervision over them and see that they did do it.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD M. DAWSON, CHIEF CLERK INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. HOLMAN. As this gentleman is here I would like to ask him a question in regard to this railroad commissioner's office. What is your position?

Mr. DAWSON. I am chief clerk of the Interior Department.

Mr. HOLMAN. What would be your opinion about this matter?

Mr. DAWSON. It would be more in accordance with the general scheme of the organization of the Department if one of the bookkeepers possibly should be denominated commissioner, so as to have a bureau chief. The Department is, of course, under the supervision of the Secretary, and I think it would be more in accordance with the organization of the Department to have some one in particular charge of the office to be designated as the commissioner of railroads.

Mr. HOLMAN. How much additional force would be necessary do you suppose?

Mr. DAWSON. I do not think it would be necessary to have any greater force than the two bookkeepers talked about and a stenographer.

Mr. DINGLEY. One of these bookkeepers to be designated as commissioner?

Mr. DAWSON. That is the only thing.

Mr. DINGLEY. Two bookkeepers and a copyist, that is if the engineer is dropped. Is the messenger actually necessary?

Mr. DAWSON. Yes, sir; they ought to have a messenger. One person could be designated as commissioner to make it a bureau of the Department which would be more in accordance with the general organization of the Department.

The CHAIRMAN. Where is that bureau located now?

Mr. TAYLOR. There is an act of Congress requiring it to be located in the Pension Office.

The CHAIRMAN. What rooms do you occupy?

Mr. TAYLOR. Two large rooms.

The CHAIRMAN. No rent is paid?

Mr. TAYLOR. No rent is paid. Formerly there was rent paid, and there was an act of Congress putting it in the Pension Office, and the Pension Commissioner was pretty clamorous to get that room, but of course he could not get it.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, there is an item for one engineer submitted for the electric-light plant.

The CHAIRMAN. Did not you estimate for that last year?

Mr. DAWSON. Yes, sir; we have had an estimate of it for several years. It was necessary in order to have some competent man to run our electric-light plant.

The CHAIRMAN. Who runs that engine now?

Mr. DAWSON. We have an assistant engineer who runs it, and we have to have a fireman, not an experienced man, to run it at night and at night is when we require the most service.

The CHAIRMAN. How long has that employment continued?

Mr. DAWSON. Ever since we have had the plant, about, I suppose, eight or ten years.

The CHAIRMAN. You have had no trouble?

Mr. DAWSON. We have not had any trouble so far, except the assistant engineer whom we have there is an excellent man. He was brought up with the company who put in the plant, and he has told me he can not stay at that salary, and I do not think I can get any competent engineer for \$1,000.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not asking for an increase in his salary?

Mr. DAWSON. But we want an engineer at \$1,200 and an assistant engineer retained at \$1,000. Then there is another matter of books for the library. The committee inserted the words "professional and scientific." The law now provides for the purchase of professional and scientific books, and books which we have heretofore for a good many years purchased out of that appropriation have been works of current literature for our circulating library. The Comptrollers now confine it to professional and scientific books and of course the result has been we have not been able to make any additions to our library. We have in the building the scientific library of the Patent Office and that provides for that class of literature and I would be very glad if you would strike out the words "professional and scientific."

Mr. DINGLEY. You have a circulating library for the employes?

Mr. DAWSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. Purely a literary library?

Mr. DAWSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. Has any other Department such a circulating library?

Mr. DAWSON. Yes, sir; the Treasury has, I know. Then I was going to suggest to the committee the appropriation for contingent expenses for printing and binding and for stationery for the Civil Service Commission be made in a special appropriation; that is, to have no connection with ours. This is the only connection that that Commission has with the Interior Department.

The CHAIRMAN. Are not you on good terms with the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. DAWSON. Personally I am, but I do not believe much in civil service myself. But they have a disbursing officer, Mr. Chairman, who is just as competent to expend the small appropriation which they require as we are for them. It is only a suggestion that they might have their own money to expend instead of requiring us to do so.



INDEX.

	Page.
Ainsworth, Col. F. C.....	12-16
Bartlett, George A.....	3
Bounty claims.....	6-8
Bussey, Gen. Cyrus.....	16-20
Cobb, Hon. S. W.....	26, 27
Coulter, T. B.....	3-6
Daskam, E. G.....	33
Davis, Maj. George B.....	12
Dawson, Edward M.....	38, 39
Department of Justice:	
Assistant Attorney-General.....	27, 28
Interior Department:	
Assistant Secretary.....	16-20
Chief clerk.....	38, 39
Commissioner of General Land Office.....	28-32
Commissioner of Pensions.....	20-26
Commissioner of Railroads.....	34-38
General Land Office.....	28-32
International Committee on Weights and Measures.....	32, 33
Leech, E. O.....	8-10
Mendenhall, Prof. Thomas C.....	32, 33
New Orleans subtreasury.....	33
Patterson, J. N.....	6-8
Pension appeals.....	16-20
Raum, Hon. Green B.....	20-26
Records of War of Rebellion.....	12
Shields, George H.....	27, 28
St. Louis subtreasury.....	26, 27
Stone, Hon. William M.....	28-32
Taylor, H. A.....	34-38
Treasury Department:	
Director of the Mint.....	8-10
Disbursing Clerk.....	3
Division of Public Moneys.....	33
Marine-Hospital Service.....	10-12
Second Auditor.....	6-8
Sixth Auditor.....	3-6
Subtreasury, New Orleans, La.....	33
Subtreasury, St. Louis, Mo.....	26, 27
War Department:	
Record and Pension Division.....	12-16
Wyman, Dr. Walker.....	10-12







